

County, Pa., opposing a modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2481. Also, petition of Mrs. M. Ramsey, of Mount Pleasant, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing a referendum of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2482. Also, petition of Mrs. William Bungard, of Mount Pleasant, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing a repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2483. Also, petition of Celia J. Smith and 100 other citizens of Ligonier, Westmoreland County, Pa., upholding the eighteenth amendment and Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2484. Also, petition of Mary L. Stouffer, treasurer of the Westmoreland City Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing a referendum of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2485. Also, petition of F. J. Wagner, Irwin, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing a referendum of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2486. Also, petition of Mrs. Thomas Smith, Westmoreland City, Pa., urging support of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2487. Also, petition of Edwin McClintock, pastor of Puckety U. P. Church, New Kensington, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2488. Also, petition of Anna Previte, Avonmore, Westmoreland County, Pa., urging support of the eighteenth amendment and opposing modification of same; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2489. Also, petition of Carrie W. Shrum, of Irwin, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2490. Also, petition of precinct committeewoman, Mrs. Martha A. Watson, of Ardara, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing a repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2491. Also, petition of the Irwin Ministerial Association of Irwin, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing a referendum on the prohibition question; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2492. Also, petition of Mrs. William Stauffer, of Westmoreland City, Pa., opposing a referendum on the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2493. Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Scottdale, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2494. Also, petition of officers and members of St. Paul's Lutheran Sunday school of Vandergrift, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing modification or repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2495. Also, petition of the Ladies' Patriotic Association of Salina, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing a repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2496. Also, petition of officers and members of the Shearersburg United Presbyterian Sabbath school of Shearersburg, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing a modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2497. Also, petition of Scottdale Ministerium, of Scottdale, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2498. Also, petition of Council of St. Paul's Lutheran Church of Vandergrift, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing a repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2499. Also, petition of members of the Winners' Bible, Grace Reformed Church, Jeannette, Westmoreland County, Pa., supporting the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2500. Also, petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Trafford, Westmoreland County, Pa., representing 30 people, opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or by State

legislatures, and ask their Congressman and Senators to vote against such a resolution and to vote for adequate appropriations for law enforcement and for education in law observance; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2501. Also, petition of members of the Three M's Bible Class, Grace Reformed Church, Jeannette, Westmoreland County, Pa., upholding the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2502. Also, petition of members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Greensburg, Westmoreland County, Pa., representing 125 people, opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or by State legislatures, and ask their Congressman and Senators to vote against such a resolution and to vote for adequate appropriations for law enforcement and for education in law observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2503. Also, petition of members of Grace Reformed Church of Jeannette, Westmoreland County, Pa., opposing legislation which would jeopardize the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2504. Also, petition of Euphemia Smith, of Westmoreland City, Westmoreland County, Pa., protesting against any change in present prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2505. Also, petition of Thomas Smith, of Westmoreland City, Westmoreland County, Pa., protesting against any change in the present prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2506. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Common Council of the city of Buffalo, urging passage of bill legalizing the manufacture and sale of 4 per cent beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2507. Also, petition of the legislature of the State of South Carolina, relating to a preferential excise tax on tobacco products manufactured from tobacco purchased from the farmers of South Carolina; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou ever-blessed God, our lives are filled with strange questions and mysteries. We pray to-day that Thou wilt sweep away the lore of wonder and make the obscure plain until it blossoms with rest and contentment. As Thy command and our obligations are universal, enable us to rise, and do Thou lead the way into that chamber of our souls where goodness dominates, where wisdom is supernal, where strength is divine, and where we are blessed and encouraged by the fruits of the Spirit. Take our many faculties, our intellects, our moral and social natures, and harmonize them with the universal law of love and brotherhood. Then, Heavenly Father, the poor will no longer despise the rich and the rich will no longer look with contempt upon the poor, for such an overflow of God in the soul is the most beautiful flower of Christian knighthood. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9203. An act to improve the facilities of the Federal reserve system for the service of commerce, industry, and agriculture, to provide means for meeting the needs of member banks in exceptional circumstances, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to said bill, requests a conference with the



House thereon, and appoints Mr. WALCOTT, Mr. TOWNSEND, and Mr. GLASS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 292) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to aid in the establishment of agricultural credit corporations, and for other purposes; insists upon its amendment to said joint resolution, requests a conference with the House thereon, and appoints Mr. NORRIS, Mr. McNARY, and Mr. SMITH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore, in accordance with the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution No. 19, had appointed the Senator from Virginia, Mr. GLASS, to place, on behalf of the Senate, a wreath on the grave of Mary, mother of Washington, at Fredericksburg, Va., on February 22, 1932.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein four short poems, one about Mary, the mother of Washington, and three others about George Washington.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, although all this is very nice, I feel that the RECORD is no place for poems. If we permit this, we would have all the poets in the country trying to get into the RECORD. I object.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, may I have the attention of the majority leader for a moment? Last evening when there were very few Members present I agreed to a unanimous-consent request that when the House recess next Monday we would come together again at 2.30 o'clock p. m. Since that time a great many Members have been to me and have expressed the thought that we ought not to meet again on Monday afternoon, because it is a general holiday and so much going on in other places that it would be better if we did not come together until the following Tuesday noon. I rise to put that matter up to the majority leader.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, in order to put the matter up to the House I shall submit a resolution. I think if George Washington were alive and here next Monday he would feel that this Congress should go ahead and attend to business, commencing at 2.30 o'clock in the afternoon, rather than adjourn. If the gentleman wants to take the responsibility of stopping the business on that day, very well.

Mr. SNELL. Oh, no; that is not my attitude. I merely want to bring the matter up for consideration.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### House Resolution 154

*Resolved*, That at the conclusion of the exercises arranged by the joint committee pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 4 and the House Concurrent Resolution 12 on Monday, February 22, 1932, the Speaker shall declare the House to be in recess until 2.30 o'clock p. m.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that the purpose of the gentleman is to read these poems he referred to a moment ago. With all of the business that we have before us, I feel impelled to object.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOYLAN. My inquiry is to ask, through the Speaker, whether the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] is a psychic or a mind reader.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not answer that question.

#### GAG RULE

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be privileged to address the House for 20 minutes right now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 10 years now I have been in association with the membership of this House. I have heard men stand here and sing swan songs, asserting the vast sacrifice they had made by service here. Mr. Speaker, it has been no sacrifice on my part. It has been the proudest privilege which might have been conferred upon me to be in touch both mentally and physically with the magnificent characters I have met here. For the moment, Mr. Speaker, I want to express the desire which has been uppermost in my thought ever since I came here, and that is, if I could not win the applause, then that I might win the respect of my every colleague.

In recent days I have been taking an attitude here greatly out of the ordinary, and I am offering a plea now that every Member of the House may be kind enough to put himself in my place before he shall censure me for my attitude. For nearly 10 years I have stood here and proclaimed, in my feeble way as best I could, against the operation of the gag-rule system as practiced for long years by the Mellonites in control of this House. Will any friend ask me now to stultify myself by remaining silent when that which I condemned in Mellonites is practiced by Democrats? I think not. I have been distressed beyond words sometimes at the attitude of the House as at present organized in following so closely along the lines followed by my Mellonite friends throughout the years. I think so much of many of my colleagues over on the other side that I should perhaps make a distinction between a Mellonite and a Republican, and I withdraw the former appellation as to some of you. In recent days we have seen legislation brought in under suspension of the rules, with no opportunity at all to offer an amendment, no opportunity at all to read the legislation until it came directly to the time for consideration. That is what I call gag rule. I do not like it. I do not think anyone else likes it. Then, let me call attention to another situation, and that is the frame of mind which is engendered by obedience to the gag-rule system.

You will recall that when we were discussing a few days ago the bill known as the Steagall bill we were brazenly informed, when we asked for testimony given by a certain gentleman in the hearing, that that was not good for us, and we did not get it. The same gentleman expressed great fear that if the average Member of this House should know what the spokesman knew, if the average Member should know what some member of the committee knew, the world might be turned upside down before breakfast. Ah, my friends, that is a pretty low estimate of the character of the average Member of this House, and I resent it. Oh, I wish that the average Member among us could utterly divest himself of that hideous thing called fear. I remember when we were discussing, some years ago, the Italian debt settlement there were some learned commissioners here from Italy. We were talking about the ability of Italy to pay.

I remember a dear old colleague of ours, now gone to his reward, who was one of the fearful kind, and he boldly expressed the fear that there might be international complications before night if the membership of this House should be permitted to know what he knew about statements made by Mussolini's commissioners at that moment in Washington. I recall that at that time, having great respect for the elderly gentleman who made that statement, I did not reply other than to tell him a little story which I thought would illustrate the utter needlessness of entertaining fear. I do know how better I might now appeal to my colleagues who are afraid to permit common Members of this House to know what uncommon Members know than by repeating that story. Parky Doody was a professional horse trader.



He lived in a little village near my home town. He was the best horse trader in the State. He admitted it. For the information of younger gentlemen here, and all ladies, I will say that in that day it was the practice of the professional horse traders to get together a great band of decrepit horses, usually a few racers, a few fighting cocks, and perhaps a bulldog and travel about the country very much like a circuit rider, appearing at each place at regular intervals. One day, along to this village where Parky lived, came a new band of horse traders. At their head was a Hebrew brother. Parky and the leader of the band jockeyed around all afternoon trying to make a horse trade, and in the evening the trade was made. The next morning even the little boys on the street laughed at Parky because they had heard their elders say he had been unmercifully worsted in the trade. Parky's pride was hurt. He resolved then and there to get even. He knew that these travelers would return to his village 30 days hence, so he began laying his plans. But about 10 days before the travelers were expected to return a couple of missionary priests came along and began holding a mission in the little parish church. Parky was attending the mission. He was trying to be good. He wanted to be good, but he could not forget he had to get even with that Hebrew brother. So the night before the travelers were expected to return Parky went over to the priest's house. He called the father out on the porch where none other could hear. He said, "Father, I have a question to ask, and upon your answer depends ever and ever so much to me." The father was alarmed, and he said, "What is it, Parky?" Parky said, "Father, would it be a sin to cheat a Jew?" The father said, "Why, Parky, of course it would. Why do you ask such a foolish question?" Parky again asked, "Would it be the same sin to cheat a Jew that it would to cheat a Christian?" The father replied in the same manner. Parky started to go away, his head hanging down, looking very disconsolate. The father called him to return, and putting his arm around his back and patting him on the shoulder, he said, "Parky, I would not worry about it; it won't happen." [Laughter.]

Now, the next time our fearful brothers come to us, fearful that if we knew what they know about the testimony of General Dawes, deleted or in its full profane regalia, let them remember the story of Parky Doody.

Friends, I do not know who has been responsible for the bringing of the system of gag rule among us in recent days. I cast no aspersions in any direction; but, one thing I do know, and that is that this magnificent Speaker of yours and mine has had nothing to do with the promotion of the gag-rule principle here in this House. [Applause.]

Many, many times in the darkening day, on many and many an occasion during the tired evening hours when I had been contending as earnestly and ably as I knew how against the practice of the infamous system of gag rules by the Mellonite controllers—

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Oh, certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Can the gentleman from Nebraska inform the House who applied the gag rule on the Veterans' Committee during the present session of Congress?

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman well knows himself that I protested against anything of the kind.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Then the gentleman admits it has been applied by somebody, does he not?

Mr. HOWARD. Applied by every Mellonite organization since I have been here. [Applause.] The gentleman, as one member of that committee, knows that I protested all the time. The gentleman knows that I protested a couple of weeks ago on the same line and told this entire committee I would protest, even on the floor of the House, against that gag rule, even though it might be invoked in behalf of almost sacred legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I am glad the gentleman said that, because it is true that he did protest, but it

brings out the fact that the Democrats, under this leadership, have invoked the gag rule.

Mr. HOWARD. My dear fellow, that is just what I am stating, and against which I am protesting.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Not until I have finished with the gentleman from South Dakota. I am excoriating Democrats now for the damnable practice of emulating the Mellonites. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Nebraska well knows that during the entire service of the gentleman from South Dakota as chairman of the Veterans' Committee every bill he brought upon this floor was brought in under a rule where you could not change the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t," where it had to be swallowed under 20 minutes of debate to a side, and where the membership did not have the right to impress upon that legislation its own desires. The gentleman well knows that was the kind of gag rule which has gotten into the system of the gentleman from Nebraska until he still believes it exists here on the floor, when it does not now exist. [Laughter.]

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. HOWARD. I will yield; but let me remind the gentleman that my little 20 minutes are fleeting.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I would say that I know the gentleman from Texas would not deliberately misrepresent the facts, but he must recall, although he might not have been present on the floor, that when the last veterans' bill—the so-called Rankin bill, from which I took my name, because I did not believe in it after it had been changed by the House—was brought into the House, we had four or five days of debate here, and every amendment possible, including the Cochran and Connery amendments, were considered.

Mr. BLANTON. That was not the gentleman's bill, because he took his name off of it. And that was the bill, I will state to my friend, that passed this House almost unanimously; there were only about 6 votes in the Senate against it, and yet when it went to the White House it was vetoed and brought back here. Then the gentleman and his party killed it and substituted for it another gag-rule bill, passed under a rule, with 20 minutes debate to the side, allowing no amendments to be offered to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. My object in answering the gentleman was to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he misstated the facts when he said the gentleman from South Dakota had brought all veterans' legislation into this House under a gag rule, when the gentleman from South Dakota did no such thing.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman did not "bring" that bill here. He did not sponsor it. He took his name off of it and had it called the "Rankin" bill, which passed overwhelmingly, and then when it was vetoed and killed the gentleman did substitute for it a gag bill passed under gag rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I am being more or less spoiled. [Laughter.] Now, my friends, I want to return to the statement I started to make when I was interrupted. I have said that this magnificent Speaker of yours and mine has damned on many occasions the Mellonite gag-rule system—damned it to as hot a place in the hottest corner of tradition's hottest hell as even the lurid language of Charley Dawes could consign it.

Oh, gentlemen, you remember how nobly JOHN GARNER stood here and pleaded with the House against the gag-rule system practiced in the Committee on Ways and Means during the last session. My friends, many and many an evening time, in the tired hours, after a day of denunciation of the gag-rule system, I remember that dear JOHN



GARNER would come to me, put his arm around me lovingly, like a brother, pat me on the shoulder, and say: "Do not worry about it, old Roman. There may come a day when we will control this House [laughter and applause] and in that day this damnable Mellonite practice will be no longer permitted."

If it is true, and possibly it is, that there has been some practice of it here recently, my main plea is that all of you and the country believe that poor JOHN GARNER, sitting here with a bare majority of only 2 or 3, and some of us rather uncertain at that [laughter], is doing the very best he can under the circumstances. In the half minute left to me I just want to say, with reference to my anti-gag-rule Speaker, God bless him! [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### ECONOMY COMMITTEE

Mr. POU, from the Committee on Rules, presented the following privileged report from that committee, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

#### REPORT NO. 586

The Committee on Rules having had under consideration House Resolution 151, reports the same to the House with an amendment striking out all of the preamble, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the resolution as so amended be adopted.

#### AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATIONS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 292) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to aid in the establishment of agricultural credit corporations, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 292), with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JONES, FULMER, and HAUGEN.

#### IMPROVEMENT OF FACILITIES OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9203) to improve the facilities of the Federal reserve system for the service of commerce, industry, and agriculture, to provide means for meeting the needs of member banks in exceptional circumstances, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 9203, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STEAGALL, BRAND of Georgia, STEVENSON, McFADDEN, and STRONG of Kansas.

#### SAN CARLOS (WHITE MOUNTAIN) INDIAN RESERVATION, ARIZ.

Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### House Resolution 155

Resolved, That the Senate be requested to return to the House of Representatives the bill (H. R. 8824) entitled "An act to restore certain lands to the San Carlos (White Mountain) Indian Reservation, Ariz."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### THE LIBEL SUIT OF CANNON AGAINST TINKHAM

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes in reply to certain statements made on the floor in reference to me yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, certain remarks made by the honorable Representative from Texas, Mr. BLANTON, have been brought to my attention. He made them yesterday in reference to a suit for libel now pending between Bishop James Cannon, jr., and myself in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. I do not think it important at all that I should reply, but just for the RECORD I want to say a few words in relation to the questions concerning the pleadings in the case to which he referred. I think the best way to proceed is for me to read my answer in the suit:

#### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

James Cannon, jr., plaintiff, v. George Holden Tinkham, defendant.  
At Law No. 79715

Now comes the defendant and for pleas in the above-entitled cause says:

(1) That he is a Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of Massachusetts and that he has been a Member of the Congress since March 4, 1915;

(2) That on June 21, 1930, he made the following statement:

"Lest Bishop Cannon shall delude his followers into thinking the charges which I made against him in the House of Representatives were unfounded, and meeting his challenge that I divest myself of my congressional immunity, I desire to restate over my signature the charges I made in the House of Representatives that he is a shameless violator of the Federal corrupt practices act, a criminal statute; that he received \$65,300, mostly in cash, from a New York capitalist, Mr. Jameson, during the 1928 elections and illegally concealed the receipt of all of this money until February 15, 1929, and has not yet accounted for \$48,300 of this amount, refusing to do so before the Senate lobby investigating committee, before which he appeared voluntarily, and where he was under oath and could have been cross-examined."

(3) That such statement was a statement of fact, and true, and that it was a privileged statement;

(4) That he was not actuated by malice, but, on the contrary, that he was actuated by a sense of high public duty to expose the true character of the plaintiff; and

(5) That he denies each and every other allegation of the plaintiff and leaves the plaintiff to his proof.

GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM, pro se.

Mr. Speaker, I thought when I drew this answer that it was simple and direct. It pleaded, first, truth, and, second, privilege, but you will note that it did not say congressional privilege or congressional immunity. The usual defenses in pleadings in all libel actions are truth and privilege. Privilege in a libel action, on the part of the defense, grows out of the character of the parties to the suit or of the character of the statement that is made or of the circumstances in which the statement is made, and when this plea was drawn—and it was drawn by me—it was meant simply to raise such general privileges as can be raised in an action for libel.

I stated in my plea that it was a privileged statement after admitting that I had divested myself of my congressional immunity when I made the statement upon which was based the libel action, and I want it distinctly understood that I did not raise the question of congressional privilege or the question of congressional immunity in my plea but merely the general principle of privilege which is accorded to anyone filing an answer to an action for libel.

Now, it so happens that in this District it is necessary to set out what privilege is relied upon. This I did not do, and therefore the attorney for Bishop Cannon took advantage of this situation—and I am not blaming him at all for it—and went to the court and filed a demurrer, which in this District is called a motion to strike, saying I should set up what privilege or privileges I relied upon.

Then I turned the case over to an attorney who was more familiar with the pleadings in this District than I was. I understand from the honorable Representative from Texas that my attorney did raise some question in relation to congressional privilege. It was the first time that I knew he had, and, as far as I was concerned, I made no suggestion of that character to him.

The court decided that in my plea the character of privilege upon which I relied should be set up, and my attorney has filed pleas which, I understand, the plaintiff's attorney



has accepted as being sufficient to make the case ripe for trial.

In these pleas my attorney did not invoke congressional privilege. How could he, as a matter of law, after I had waived congressional privilege in the statement upon which I am being sued?

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINKHAM. I yield to the honorable gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Massachusetts is a graduate of one of the leading law schools of the United States, is he not?

Mr. TINKHAM. I attended the Harvard Law School.

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman is a practicing attorney in Massachusetts.

Mr. TINKHAM. I was up to 18 years ago, when I came here.

Mr. BLANTON. Being so, he started out and filed pro se a plea setting up the fact that he was a Congressman representing the people of Massachusetts in the United States House of Representatives, did he not?

Mr. TINKHAM. That is what I said.

Mr. BLANTON. Then he pleaded privilege, did he not?

Mr. TINKHAM. Yes; I said it was a privileged statement.

Mr. BLANTON. And the only thing the attorneys for Bishop Cannon did was to move to strike out that one sentence.

Mr. TINKHAM. True.

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman's lawyers came back and pleaded that you had filed it yourself, and had inadvertently so drawn it.

Mr. TINKHAM. I do not know. I have no evidence of that.

Mr. BLANTON. And your lawyers said that you could not waive it, that the Constitution had so surrounded Congressmen with protection that you could not waive it.

Mr. TINKHAM. They may have argued that, but they did not put it into any plea.

Mr. BLANTON. Did they not put it into an amended plea?

Mr. TINKHAM. No; not as I understand it.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is very kind to yield, and I appreciate it. Is not it a fact that in this morning's paper the gentleman gave the press his picture—which is a splendid picture [laughter]—and a statement that he was filing to-day a new plea waiving all immunity; did he not give that statement to the press?

Mr. TINKHAM. No. I gave no statement to the press except the speech I made on the floor day before yesterday, which the honorable gentleman from Texas commented upon yesterday.

Mr. BLANTON. That was given out "for release on delivery," was it not?

Mr. TINKHAM. That is true; and I meant it to be published. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Massachusetts will be fair to a man who can not speak from this forum. Will not the gentleman be fair enough to explain about the newspaper reports that the court, after the hearing of the indictment which the gentleman's energy has been instrumental in getting the court and grand jury to indict the bishop—did not the court say that there was no charge of violating the law against Bishop Cannon?

Mr. TINKHAM. Of which case is the honorable Representative speaking—the civil case against me for libel or the criminal case against Bishop Cannon for violations of the Federal corrupt practices act?

Mr. BLANTON. Did not the gentleman help to get an indictment against Bishop Cannon?

Mr. TINKHAM. I helped in no way.

Mr. BLANTON. Did not the gentleman help to influence it?

Mr. TINKHAM. I helped in no way. I think it is a very improper thing for the honorable Representative from Texas to suggest that I attempted to influence a grand jury in the performance of its duty.

Mr. BLANTON. What is the purpose of the gentleman in making all these speeches in the newspapers and from this forum about a law case that ought to be tried in court?

Mr. TINKHAM. My purpose is to bring first to the attention of this House—

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Is it permissible for a witness to leave the stand and the cross-examining attorney to approach within striking distance of the witness?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly it is permissible.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts addressed the House, and if he yields to the gentleman from Texas and gives the gentleman from Texas all the time he wishes that is his privilege. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if he did not say in his speech the day before yesterday that he went before the Caraway committee and lodged all these facts against the bishop, and that he tried to get the Caraway committee to take action against him?

Mr. TINKHAM. I did not. Let us be exact.

Mr. BLANTON. What did he say?

Mr. TINKHAM. I say to the honorable Representative from Texas, without offense, that I never have met a man in my life whose brain receiving a straight statement could reproduce it distorted in so fantastic a way.

Mr. BLANTON. I am just referring to the English language. The gentleman did appear before the Caraway committee, did he not?

Mr. TINKHAM. Let me make a statement as to the exact facts. I appeared before the Caraway committee.

Mr. BLANTON. For what purpose?

Mr. TINKHAM. To make general charges against a number of ecclesiastical organizations that in my opinion were violating the old American principle of separation of church and state. During the time that I was before the committee, and only for two or three minutes, I brought to the attention of the committee the fact that Bishop Cannon's committee—that is, his political committee—had reported \$17,000 as having been received from one Jameson, and that Mr. Jameson had stated before another committee that he had given Bishop Cannon \$65,300.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman willing for me to put Mr. Jameson's testimony in the RECORD?

Mr. TINKHAM. Wait a moment. I asked the committee to investigate that discrepancy, and that is all that I did.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not a fact that Judge Gordon, who sustained Bishop Cannon's motion to strike out the gentleman's plea of privilege, is a fundamental wet himself?

Mr. TINKHAM. I know nothing about his position on that question, absolutely nothing.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it not a fact that the judge in sustaining the demurrer to the indictment held that there was not a single thing in there that showed a violation of law?

Mr. TINKHAM. I do not think he did that.

Mr. BLANTON. Who is it that is having the district attorney appeal from that judgment of the court? I am interested in knowing that. Why does not the district attorney accept that judgment, that that indictment is not good, and why does he want to appeal it and cause further expense to the people of the District?

Mr. TINKHAM. If he thinks that Bishop Cannon is guilty, it is his duty to appeal the decision, and he certainly would not have brought the case before the grand jury unless he thought he was guilty.

Mr. BLANTON. Then the gentleman approves of his action in appealing?

Mr. TINKHAM. Certainly. I believe this case ought to be carried to its end.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman not backing up the district attorney in his appeal?

Mr. TINKHAM. I have done nothing in relation to the district attorney.



Mr. BLANTON. Then, the gentleman is willing for the district attorney to drop it and stop costing the people money?

Mr. TINKHAM. No; I am not.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

#### STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9349) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 9349, with Mr. McREYNOLDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama rose.

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama such time as he desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for one hour.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I am sure it would be more interesting to the visitors if field day in no man's land could continue, but there comes a time when Congress must give very serious attention to privileged bills which seek to provide funds for carrying on essential activities of the Government. I will say that the RECORDS of yesterday, the day before, and to-day are well worth keeping, because there can be found in the RECORDS of those three days some very instructive data and information, interestingly told, relating to a great number of subjects now engaging public attention.

We will now return to the consideration of the pending appropriation bill, and it has been the practice of the Committee on Appropriations, as well as the Members of the House, to forget politics in the consideration of all such bills.

In presenting the recommendations of the committee I feel sure I will meet with a fine spirit of cooperation on the part of the House to effect all possible economies in government if good reasons can be assigned therefor. I wish to make grateful acknowledgment to the members of the subcommittee who assisted in preparing the recommendations set out in the pending bill for their very helpful and splendid cooperation, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN], to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE], and to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM]. I am sure other committee members will permit me to express my especial appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE], the former chairman of the subcommittee, for his very helpful assistance. The committee wishes me to thank our efficient clerk, Mr. Bob Nagle, for his invaluable aid.

I pause here long enough to pay brief tribute to one of our departed colleagues who, because of his long successful business life and his extensive travel, both at home and abroad, was so well equipped as to effectively aid the committee in its deliberations. Congressman Ackerman, to whom I refer, was an indefatigable worker and a valuable member of our committee from the day of its formation in 1921 to the time of his death in 1931. He spent much of his time in and out of Congress in seeking first-hand information as to the working of the four governmental units which our committee had to deal with, and I know I express the sentiments of all my colleagues on that committee in saying that his passing was a great loss, not only to Congress but to our country as well.

Those of you, who served with him, will remember that he always manifested a keen interest in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, and during his membership on

the committee it was his unvarying, unfailing custom, in connection with a bill like the one now pending, to make a statement of the real accomplishment of that bureau. As a tribute to his memory, our committee wish to carry on this worthwhile work of his, and I shall later insert a statement following the general lines in which he presented to the House every year the activities of this bureau.

It is pleasing to be able to say that the subcommittee was in full agreement as to all items in the pending bill, except one, and our differences as to that will be the subject of discussion on next Tuesday. So far as the other recommendations of the bill are concerned, the subcommittee and the full committee were in complete agreement, I think.

Let us consider for a moment what the action of the Committee on Appropriations, interpreted in dollars and cents, means. This bill carries appropriations for four departments of the Government—State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor—and on page 1 of the report will be found a table showing that the appropriations for 1932 for those four departments were \$139,001,704.34 and that the Budget estimate for 1933 for these same departments was \$129,784,136.89. When the departments are separately examined it appears that the appropriations for the Department of State were reduced by the Bureau of the Budget about \$1,792,000 for the fiscal year 1933 under 1932. When, however, it is recalled that there were many nonrecurring items in 1932—that is to say, items for which no appropriations are carried in 1933, amounting to about \$2,374,015—it will be seen that the Bureau of the Budget really gave to the Department of State an increase over 1932 of \$600,000 or more.

It further appears from mere figures that appropriations for the Department of Commerce was reduced by the Bureau of the Budget about \$9,000,000, yet when we take into account the nonrecurring items of 1932, which do not appear in the 1933 bill, we find that the cut for the Department of Commerce is less than \$700,000.

The Committee on Appropriations reduced the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget for the State Department \$1,492,212.77, and reduced the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget for the Department of Commerce \$586,447. There was a substantial increase given to the Department of Justice by the Bureau of the Budget, and the Appropriations Committee have reduced the Budget estimates for the Department of Justice \$3,149,089, and for the Department of Labor \$155,070 under the Budget estimate, making the total cut by the Appropriations Committee under the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget of \$5,382,818.77 for these four departments.

Perhaps I might here say that your committee spent more than six weeks in its study and preparation of this bill, and in order that we might have some sound basis on which to predicate our study we secured charts of all the activities of those four departments. First, a chart of the departmental breakdown and then charts of the breakdowns of each separate unit in the four departments. For instance, take the Department of State, which is the first department appropriated for in the pending bill; it has about 35 main bureaus or units in the department at Washington with more than 800 employees. It maintains 59 diplomatic missions and 342 consular offices abroad, with more than 4,000 employees. Fifty-five foreign governments are represented in diplomatic missions in the United States and its territories, and they maintain 1,174 foreign consular offices in our country and its territories.

These charts give you a mental picture of the many units through which the Department of State functions.

I call attention to these charts for this reason, that under the classification law it will be found we have rapidly drifted into a government of single ideas, where no employee is supposed to do, too often, but one single thing. It is very easy, with the classifications that have been established, to bring strong pressure upon the several departments to establish separate units or bureaus, so that there may be numerous bureau chiefs and assistant bureau chiefs, with salaries altogether out of proportion to that of the real workers in the bureau.



That is one of the errors that sooner or later this Congress must correct. It is largely a fundamental error of existing law, which, I feel, needs study in connection with what this Congress may provide for in consolidating separate Government activities, so as to avoid duplications.

The same thing occurs in the Department of Commerce. We find they also have a very ambitious set-up in their department at Washington. The chart shows the innumerable breakdowns of these departments into separate units. If the Members are interested further in the study of these maps and charts which are here exhibited they can be found in the Appropriations Committee room.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Do I understand that all of this condition, to which the gentleman has referred, is a matter of law and not of administration?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It is largely a matter of administration.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I understood the gentleman to say it was a matter of law.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I said there is a classification act which furnishes a great temptation to all departments to yield to entreaties of their employees to establish many separate units and place over such units bureau chiefs and assistant bureau chiefs. I feel that is a matter that needs correction.

You will find on this map prepared by the State Department the locations of our embassies, legations, and other Foreign Service posts. Our 59 diplomatic embassies and 342 consular offices will be found widely scattered throughout the world. We have here an insert map which gives more clearly to the eye where these positions are located in European countries. This map will also be on file in the Appropriations Committee room for the information of the House.

Now, coming to the appropriations carried for the State Department, as I stated, the bill will soon be read under the 5-minute rule, and the committee will be pleased to answer inquiries as to all of the many separate items for which appropriations are carried. I thought, however, it might be interesting to call to your attention some of the outstanding reductions appearing on pages 6 and 7 of the report. You might be interested, for instance, in the fund that has been carried for a long while of \$400,000 and known as the emergency fund to meet emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service. For reasons which the committee felt were sound, we cut that from \$400,000 to \$200,000.

Take the item for post allowances to Foreign Service officers, which is a fund that has been distributed by the Secretary of State for the purpose of supplementing the pay of some Foreign Service officers at different posts. We cut that from \$100,000 to \$50,000, for reasons fully set out in the report, and which we think the House will approve.

With reference to the Foreign Service building fund, you will recall that Congress in 1926 authorized \$10,000,000 to be expended in the purchase of sites and in the construction of buildings thereon for the Foreign Service. It was intended, as far as possible, that the commission would build what might be known as combination buildings suitable for both residential and office purposes, so that not only the State Department and the Commerce Department might be housed therein, but also all other Government departments that might have representatives in the foreign field. There has been appropriated under that authorization \$8,835,000, leaving a balance of \$1,165,000 unappropriated. Mr. Merrill, the very capable secretary of the commission, has submitted a very complete report, which will be found in the hearings on page 431 et seq.

You will note that this map indicates where we own sites improved and unimproved in foreign countries. In other words, black represents sites on which are buildings, and it will be noted they are well scattered. There are 24 sites on which there are buildings now occupied by Government

offices. There are five in yellow where we own sites on which we are now constructing buildings, and on one of which is a fine office building in the city of Paris.

The green represents sites for which plans are now being drawn for buildings to be erected in the future. All of the sites shown have been paid for except the one at Rome, on which we owe about \$1,000,000, but for which the commission has sufficient money already appropriated. The yellow, seven in number, represents sites for which no plans have been drawn or are being contemplated at present.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Do I understand that these buildings are outside the appropriations for the embassies we now have?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No. These buildings are for that purpose.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Our ambassadors are housed in these buildings?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Not in all of them but in some of them.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I recall that the Committees on Foreign Affairs had their members go to inspect these buildings.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The chairmen of the Foreign Affairs Committees of the House and the Senate, as well as the ranking minority members of the two committees, are members of the Foreign Building Commission, as the gentleman may remember.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I was anxious to know whether these buildings are in addition to those?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No. Some of these buildings have been built by that commission and many sites have been purchased by the commission, but some of the sites and buildings here shown were owned before that commission was formed in 1926.

However, the commission, under that act, has charge of all these buildings and sites. All previous acts were repealed, and all of our foreign building program placed in charge of this commission. Some of this construction had been authorized prior to the organization of that commission, and the commission carried forward the work under the act of its creation.

Following this you will find the item of representation allowances. There has been some discussion of this, you will remember, in the past two years in the House. There had never been any appropriation for this purpose up to two years ago. The first appropriation carried was \$92,000, which was later increased to \$125,000. The committee reduced this appropriation to \$25,000 and suggests that instead of making allotments in advance from this fund that it be considered hereafter as a fund from which the Secretary of State is authorized to refund money to foreign officers who have had unusual expenses and to which, in the judgment of the Secretary of State, the National Government should make some contribution.

The other item you would likely be interested in is that covering rent, heat, fuel, and light in the Foreign Service, on page 7. This carries a proviso which seeks to limit the amount that may be spent for heat, light, and custodial care in a building occupied as a residence by a Foreign Service officer to the amount allowed Foreign Service officers when occupying non-Government-owned quarters. There is also a reduction in this appropriation.

On the same page there is a reduction in the pay of the three commissioners of the International Boundary Commission. This commission was established many years ago, and you will find full hearings in reference to this item. The salary of the commissioners up to two years ago had always been \$7,500. The House refused to increase it to \$10,000 and it was increased in conference. The House committee felt that the amount should be placed at what it had always been since the creation of the commission, and I invite your careful attention to the hearings on this subject.



Mr. ARNOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. ARNOLD. Did the gentleman's committee go into the question of whether or not continuation of this commission is essential?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. This commission is created under a treaty, and we did not go into that. There are some pending questions of importance now before the commission and it was intended to be a continuing commission under the treaty, and, of course, we had no authority to change it.

Mr. ARNOLD. Is there work for them to do requiring the expenditure that is being made for this purpose?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I may say this. There are some questions pending before them of importance. I have felt that so long as the commission continues there is always this danger. Parties who are interested in building power dams will make it a point to bring pressure on the two governments to refer such questions to the commission when, in fact, there is no real public need for the matters to be so referred.

Personally, I think when they shall have completed the inquiries that are now before them there is no pressing reason why the commission should be continued.

Mr. ARNOLD. It just occurred to me that this is a service that could have been dispensed with earlier, if we had gone about it properly.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is a matter, of course, for the Congress to determine, and it is not a matter our committee can control in the slightest.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would not that have to be done by treaty?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. We would have to withdraw from the treaty, of course.

There were two estimates submitted to cover the expenses of the commission to two international conferences—one known as International Radio-Telegraphic Convention and the other the Pan American Union—one to be held in Madrid and one in Montevideo, and for each of these commissions the Budget had estimated \$120,000. The committee cut the one to Madrid to \$90,000 and the one to Montevideo to \$80,000. One will be in session six weeks and the other about three months or two and a half months.

I think this covers the items that perhaps the House would be most interested in under the State Department, and, as I say, if there are other items about which you desire information, as we read the bill, the committee will be pleased to endeavor to give you the information.

Next, coming to the Department of Justice, I want to invite the attention of the committee to a very interesting statement made by the Attorney General, appearing on page 313 of the hearings. I think you will be somewhat interested to know that when the question was raised in the subcommittee as to whether the congestion in our courts is primarily due to the increased criminal business growing out of the prohibition act, the Attorney General, in response to inquiries on that subject, made a study of the subject and submitted a very interesting table in which he shows very conclusively that the civil business in our courts has grown more rapidly than has the criminal business, and I invite your attention to the very interesting statement he makes on pages 313 et seq. of the hearings.

You will also be interested in a statement made by Mr. Woodcock, who has administered the Prohibition Bureau. Permit me to say this, that no matter what may have been the individual opinion of members of the committee as to the wisdom of the prohibition amendment—and, of course, we had two members, I believe, who are not, as you know, in very great sympathy with it, all of the committee were, I think, impressed with the fact that Mr. Woodcock had administered the funds placed in his hands in a thoroughly efficient way, and I invite you to carefully read all of the hearings on that subject.

I do not think I ever heard a witness testify in reference to a controversial matter who seemed to be so free from any feeling, and who more evidently had endeavored to the ut-

most of his ability to secure high-quality men in his organization, and to avoid, as far as possible, some of the things that have been done in the past and have subjected law-enforcement officers to just criticism.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Has there been a marked improvement in the service?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think there has been since the transfer from the Treasury Department.

Mr. ARENTZ. Statements have been made that since the transfer from the Treasury Department the cost of the bureau has been increased.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will state that Congress authorized, as you know, more men for the field, and the appropriations were increased for that purpose. The last session of Congress increased the appropriation to enable the bureau to employ more field men, and the appropriation this year is just the same as in 1932; that is, for the present fiscal year.

It may be interesting to state that the amount of fines collected and paid into the Federal Treasury by this bureau during 1931 was approximately \$4,000,000 plus, and the amount of the fines assessed in cases prosecuted in State courts which the bureau instituted amounted to more than a million dollars. Mr. Woodcock was unable to state what part of the State fines had been collected, since they were payable to the State.

The amount of property seized by the bureau in 1931 amounted to about \$24,000,000. The value of the property so seized, estimated by appraisers, added to the fine collected and paid into the Federal Treasury, would have exceeded the amount of the total appropriations of \$11,000,000 carried for this particular service.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did the Government realize cash on this seized property?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. This property consisted in part of copper, alcohol, automobiles, and so forth, some of which was turned over to Government departments for use. The automobiles seized were sold in most instances, but brought little money.

Mr. ARENTZ. I am much interested in the gentleman's remarks. Do I understand the gentleman to say that there is no net cost of prohibition; that the fines and property seized amount to the appropriation?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Woodcock was not talking about the net amount. He did not take into account the court costs and expenses in the trial of cases. He was only measuring the amount that was appropriated for his bureau, with the value of the property that was seized and turned over to the Government, and the fines collected.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. That is the cost of the bureau?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The amount we appropriated for the bureau.

Mr. CHRISTGAU. Has the gentleman got the figures of the cost of enforcement, including the court costs?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. You will find that discussed in the hearings, in answer to questions by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM]. There is hardly any question in reference to prohibition enforcement that was not raised and discussed at very great length in the hearings. And you will find that Mr. Woodcock had prompt and very satisfactory answers for the numerous questions propounded by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GRIFFIN].

Mr. CLANCY. Did Colonel Woodcock give any information as to what it is costing the city, county, and State welfare commissions to support the families of prohibition offenders who have been sent to prison?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I do not think that was discussed. I suggest the gentleman refer to the hearings.

Mr. CLANCY. It is very important, when we are talking about the cost. A very large part of the cost which falls on the people is the maintenance of the families of these offenders. He might have told you that in the Department of



Justice they now have an agency for contact in respect to welfare conditions. I was near Asheville, N. C., at one time when they sent down a whole trainload of prohibition offenders to Atlanta. Hundreds of their relatives were then without support.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman has raised a controversial question. There are many who disagree wholly with the conclusions that he has reached from his study of the subject. Many feel that prohibition has brought about great savings to families, and that the money heretofore wastefully expended on liquor has been expended in providing food and raiment for the family.

I do not want to enter into what is just a controversial question. I was making simply a plain statement of what it seemed, from Colonel Woodcock's statement, the fines imposed in cases brought by that bureau and the appraised value of property seized amounted to in dollars and cents.

Mr. CLANCY. Is it not fair to add the cost to which I refer?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is a matter of argument. I recognize that the gentleman entertains that opinion. I entertain quite a different opinion, and our differences can not be settled here.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. ARNOLD. There seems to be some confusion in regard to the statement made a while ago by the gentleman from Alabama, and to get the matter cleared up let me ask him this question: Do I understand the gentleman to say that the fines, confiscations, and forfeitures amount to \$11,000,000 more than the amount appropriated in this bill?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Oh, no. I said that the fines collected were something more than \$4,000,000, and that the appraised value of the property seized, added to the fines, would equal and probably exceed the appropriation carried for this bureau, to wit, about \$11,000,000.

Mr. HART. Is the property seized property that may be resold, or does it include stills which are destroyed?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Some of the stills are destroyed, and some of the copper is used by Government agencies where those agencies may need it. Alcohol is turned over to different agencies of the Federal Government. Some of the property seized has been sold, and much of it has been destroyed.

Mr. BLANTON. And summarizing the testimony of Colonel Woodcock, it showed, did it not, that, considering the fines and the property seized, the automobiles confiscated, and so forth, the bureau was just about self-supporting?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; so far as the appropriation that we make for this bureau is concerned.

Mr. CLANCY. I do not believe the gentleman from Alabama wishes to give an unfair impression. Is it not true that the main cost of prohibition enforcement, the larger cost, larger than that of the Justice Department, is in the Treasury Department, in supporting the customs and customs border patrol and the Coast Guard?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is an item that we did not take into consideration.

Mr. CLANCY. Certainly the fines, confiscations, and property sold do not give us enough money to pay the cost of prohibition enforcement?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. My statement related only to the appropriations carried in this bill, and I had not intended to convey any different impression.

Mr. BLANTON. But the border patrol protects against aliens and narcotics and various other matters.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Those are all matters, of course, about which controversies may arise. I was simply making a statement as to this particular appropriation, and what those who are employed under this appropriation had been able to turn in to the Government in the way of fines, and so forth.

Mr. CLANCY. Is it not true that we do have a very extensive and expensive immigration border patrol and a narcotic bureau with many field agents?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Some of that appears in this bill, of course.

Mr. BOYLAN. Of course, the three departments that the gentleman enumerates are engaged in putting people in jail, are they not?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I was coming to that.

Mr. BOYLAN. I mean the three departments where the appropriations are not cut. They are engaged in putting citizens in jail.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes. There were more than three appropriations not cut, but there were three appropriations which related to law enforcement which this House has expressed great interest in, namely, the prohibition law, the antitrust law, and the immigration law, and in all of these the appropriations have been carefully administered with a view of laying aside something in the event an emergency arises, and although all of these appropriations may show this year an unexpended balance we carry the Budget estimate for these three services because the committee felt that the House was equally interested in the enforcement of all these laws. As you know, this matter will be discussed at greater length under the two hours set apart for that purpose on next Tuesday, and I am sure none of us now desire to take too much time on that subject.

The hearings are very full, and that is why I call attention to it. I do not think that any of the questions that might be asked that I could answer are not to be found in the hearings.

The next item of very great importance and from which we have made the large reductions in the Department of Justice relates to the prisons, and for that reason I have brought here a map which shows the situation. Gentlemen will remember that we had two reports—one from a congressional committee and one from the Wickersham Commission—suggesting the building of additional jails and prisons, and calling attention to the crowded conditions of the prisons we then had, and in May, 1930, as I recall, the Judiciary Committee of the House authorized the building of a number of new jails and prisons.

We had, at the time that authorization was made, just six prisons; one at Atlanta, with a housing capacity of perhaps around 2,000 but where we have been carrying fairly well over 3,000, even as high as 4,100. Then at Leavenworth we had the main prison, with a prison population of about 3,100, and the annex recently secured from the Army, within 2 miles of the main prison, where there are about 1,800 drug addicts. Then at Alderson there are about 480 women, and we had a camp that we had taken over, where we are constructing permanent buildings, known as Chillicothe, with a population of about 1,200 to 1,600, the ages ranging from 18 to 25—some older. Then we had McNeil Island prison, out on the west coast, with a population of 980. Those were the six prisons we had in 1930. We have not completed any large prison since that date.

One will come into completion about the latter part of August, 1932, known as the Northeastern Penitentiary, in Pennsylvania, with a population capacity of more than 1,200. We have built a number of camps, six in number. Formerly we had a camp in New York and one at Camp Meade, which have been abandoned. Now we maintain six camps and they now have a population of about 1,600, and it is expected that the population will be increased to about 2,000 in 1933. Then we have built some jails, likewise under the authorization of Congress. One is completed at New York; one is nearing completion at New Orleans, and one is nearing completion in El Paso. All three of these will be completed by the beginning of the fiscal year 1933, and they will have a prison capacity of about 800. That could be increased.

Then it is planned, with appropriations already made by the former Congress, to build a jail in Minnesota and one in Michigan, with a joint capacity of about a thousand, and a jail in Kentucky of about 600 capacity, adding thus an additional 1,600 prison capacity.

We have now about 13,000 prisoners in Federal prisons, jails, and camps. Then we have in jails scattered through-



out the country, several States, counties, and cities, 11,000 prisoners, making in round figures about 24,000 in Federal and State prisons. Most of those in State, county, and city jails have short-term sentences.

Now, we have on parole about 4,700. Note that has increased in the last two years from 1,200 plus to 4,700 plus. Then there are on probation now about 17,000, and that number has increased in the last two years from 4,000 plus to 17,000 plus.

I mention this because it is pertinent to what I shall say with reference to the reductions that the committee is recommending relative to a further increase of our prisons.

Another bill carries a large sum for the Public Health Service to build a narcotic farm near Lexington, Ky., with a capacity of more than 1,200. It is the purpose of the Public Health Service, when that building is completed, as it will be in the fiscal year 1934, which as you know begins July 1, 1933, to transfer those drug addicts from the annex prison near Leavenworth, over to the Lexington home.

I have called your attention to these matters in order that you may understand what prison space we will have in 1933. In the new penitentiary in Pennsylvania, more than 1,200; in the new jails that are now nearing completion, more than 1,000; in the new jails that are being planned and will be completed in 1933, more than 1,500; and then in the narcotic or drug home that is being constructed by the Public Health Service, more than 1,200. So we are providing quite liberally for the future.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman's wonderful report shows a great achievement on the part of this administration, does it not, providing and building and increasing jails to such an extent; but does the gentleman not think we should do something to try to diminish the tremendous increase in those jails? Would it not be much better to do that than to enlarge this appropriation for jails?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is just exactly what we intend asking you to approve. I was just coming to it.

Mr. SABATH. I would be delighted to vote for something like that.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I felt that a gentleman like the gentleman from Illinois, as well as others, might want information first, on which he could intelligently act, and I was seeking to give the gentleman a basis on which I think he will be justified in substantially reducing many of the appropriations recommended by the Budget for increasing jail and prison facilities.

Mr. SABATH. I will be delighted to secure additional information, but I just wanted to make that observation to give the administration credit for the great achievement in increasing jail facilities as they have in the last few years.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Permit me to say that this is under direct command of Congress, and the Congress appropriated the money for that purpose. Congress is alone responsible for the increase in jails and prisons, and at the time that this large prison expansion was provided for, namely, in 1930, as I stated, the prison population was leaping upwards and I am gratified to state to you that now it is going down.

It began to go down the latter part of 1930. It went down a little more in 1931, and the present reports in 1932 show the trend to be still downward. That was an added reason why we should give attention to what amount this bill should carry for the further expansion of our prisons.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. MAY. As a matter of information, I would like to know if the gentleman has obtained sufficient information to be able to tell us whether there has been an increase in the number of addicts to narcotics since the national prohibition law, over and above what it was before; and if so, what the increase is?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I do not recall whether there is anything in the hearings on that subject, and independent of the hearings I would not know whether there has been

shown any increase in the number of drug addicts since that time. However, the increased population of drug addicts, I think, has grown in the last 10 years.

Mr. MAY. In about what proportion?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I do not recall. The gentleman will find a table giving that information in the hearings. I do not recall offhand.

Mr. CLANCY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. CLANCY. Were there any statistics given as to the decrease in the jail population in Canada since they abolished prohibition?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No. We did not go into a discussion of matters outside of continental United States.

Mr. CLANCY. As a matter of fact, I understand their jail population has decreased and that they have abolished a prison or two.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is a matter to which I assume the gentleman will call attention on Tuesday.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. If the law against stealing were repealed, that would help to decrease the population of jails, would it not?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes. I again want to call your attention to that most interesting information which the Attorney General supplied in response to our request. He made a search for the information in response to questions asked of him, and his report was very surprising to me. You will find it on page 213, showing how rapidly since 1910 the civil business in our courts has increased. It shows that civil litigation has increased far more than our criminal business. I am trying to give you facts so that you may read statements referred to and draw your own conclusions.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that the civil business in our courts has increased, especially in the last three years, because of the tremendous number of receiverships and bankruptcies?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Unquestionably so, and that appears from the Attorney General's statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. I desire to ask the gentleman with reference to the appropriation for the United States hospital for defective delinquents at Springfield, Mo. Will the gentleman get to that later?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will get to that in a few minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. I will reserve my question until then.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. May I inquire whether or not the gentleman has reached the item relating to the industrial reformatory at Chillicothe, Ohio?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will come to that in a few minutes also. I do want to say this, as a further predicate on which the committee based its recommendations for reductions; I wish to refer to the probation system. The judges are now very much interested in giving a suspended sentence to first offenders, and you will find that this was a factor we took into account in recommending reductions in appropriations for prison expansion.

Now, then, in reference to probation, may I say this: It is interesting to note from the hearings that in 1926 and 1927 the appropriations then carried were not expended. We carried \$50,000 in 1926 and 1927 for the purpose of employing probation officers. The judges were not very much interested at that time and there were only three probation officers appointed. So the next year we reduced it to \$30,000, and we still found that not half of the appropriation was expended. Then we reduced it to \$25,000 and we found that was more than sufficient to care for it, and not until 1931, when you made a change in the fundamental law



authorizing the appointment of probation officers, did we find real interest shown by the judges. Then we carried an appropriation of \$200,000. And mark this: The probationers then increased in two years from 4,000 to over 17,000.

Mr. KELLER. With the approbation of the judges?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes. It is interesting to note, in that connection, that we now have only about 63 probation officers. They cover 55 judicial districts out of the 85, and we only carried \$230,000 for their pay in the present fiscal year and for the pay of 12 clerks. In view of the statement made by the judges, concurred in by the Attorney General, the question was submitted to the Bureau of the Budget as to the wisdom of increasing that appropriation and giving to the judges an opportunity in a larger way to exercise their discretion in the carrying out of the law which Congress passed some few years ago. Following that the Bureau of the Budget submitted to us an estimate of \$440,000; in other words, an increase of \$210,000 over the present year. The committee has approved that estimate, and you will note that, according to its report, more than 40 additional probation officers can be employed and about 30 additional clerks.

We have limited the mileage and subsistence allowances, because that is where it might be abused, to \$80,000, instead of \$120,000 as suggested by the Budget. I think you will find that this will meet with the very hearty approval of the judges. If with 63 probation officers and an appropriation of \$230,000 we have rapidly increased probationers from 4,000 to 17,000 plus, and the judges favor this increase of additional probational officers, I think you will find we can take the prison load off our jails and prisons in this way.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. As one who 35 years ago started and advocated the probation system, I may say that I did that at the time, because many arrests were made unnecessarily, and as a police magistrate, I did not like to send people, especially young people, to jail for ridiculously small offenses. I would not ask this question of every gentleman, but I know how broad minded and liberal minded the gentleman is, and does he not think it would be much better if we would eliminate many of these unnecessary arrests so that it would not be necessary to have 17,000 people, most of them young people, out on probation?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. After the gentleman has read the hearings, and I am sure he will read them, suppose the gentleman and I discuss that on Tuesday, and I shall then be glad to give the gentleman such information as I have.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for that courtesy.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know whether any evidence was offered; but if it were, it would probably be in the nature of an opinion as to whether or not liberalization of the parole law has justified itself as a corrective criminal procedure. In other words, from the gentleman's observation, does he think that liberalization of strict enforcement of sentences by the method of parole has had a good, corrective influence?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I am very pleased the gentleman has asked the question, because the judges are of the opinion it has, and the report of the probation officers is to the same effect, and what is even stronger still, the large number of volunteer probation officers and civic organizations, like Rotary and Kiwanis and others, that sometimes are interested in the future of an offender, all seem to unite in the opinion that the probation law is working splendidly in the rehabilitation of offenders.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We are all certainly pleased to have an expression of that opinion, because many of us have always been heartily in favor of the system.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It was because of this very strong indorsement by the judges and the organizations to which I have referred that the committee felt justified in recommending this appropriation to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has consumed one hour.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 30 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BOYLAN. The gentleman will recall that a special committee appointed by the Seventieth Congress of which I happened to be a member recommended an increase in the number of parole and probation officers, and also a change in the parole system, taking it out of the prison itself and making it an independent commission, on the theory that it was better to parole them than to have them in jail.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It is a very interesting report, I may say, that the gentleman's committee submitted, and evidences the fine humanity that always has characterized the gentleman in his dealing with matters of this kind.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman from Alabama yield to me once more?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. During the consideration of the Clayton Parole Act, which was a good many years ago, I was fearful, in a measure, and so stated on the floor, that, although I believed in the system, those with great influence and power behind them could easily be benefited by parole under the system and the unfortunate fellow without any influence would not receive a great deal of consideration. In this connection may I ask if the gentleman upon investigation found whether those fears that were then expressed by me were justified or whether I was erroneous in my deductions made at that time?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. We have no information to that effect; and I will state that I left out of the hearings, because the hearings were rather extended, a number of letters from judges which I now think, before Tuesday, I will endeavor to collect and insert in the RECORD. I should like for the gentleman to read just what the judges now say in reference to the parole system.

Mr. SABATH. I shall be delighted to read that.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think these letters will be informing to the House, because the judges are in better position to give information in reference to this matter than I am.

Now, coming down to the deductions that we have made, we will take, for instance, Chillicothe.

We have provided there a fund sufficient to complete the prison units, so that the boys who are there now occupying the buildings that our soldier boys occupied during the war, and which have been very comfortable, may move over into more comfortable, more permanent quarters, and this bill carries a sufficient appropriation to provide completed units and the essential utilities for such buildings.

We have deducted only \$200,000 from the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, because in looking over the building program we felt that this could very well be deferred and let the boys do the work, since one of the things that the law itself required of the Attorney General in connection with many of these prisons, Chillicothe being one, was that he should use prison labor to the fullest extent in the building of the prisons.

So we have made there a deduction of \$200,000.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand that the organic law provides for the use of prison labor to this extent, that the Attorney General may use the same whenever practicable.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I will make this statement. The gentleman is correct in stating what the law requires. I think the Attorney General has been most liberal. The pressure has been very great, as appears in the hearings. In the first place, the Members from Ohio wished to have prison labor dispensed with altogether. I took occasion to say that, in deference and out of respect to the Members



from that State, whom I hold in high regard, that that question was discussed on the floor. They protested against the brick kiln being continued, but the House overruled them. They were not in favor of prison labor being used to the extent that the law directed. That was natural. But I think the Attorney General, exercising his discretion, may have stepped over the line, rather than under the line, in reference to the employment of prison labor. But we will take that up when we reach the item in the bill.

Mr. SABATH. This prison in Chillicothe is only for juveniles?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It is supposed to be, but they have a few who are over 30 years of age.

Mr. KELLER. They are first-termers?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; I think so. Now, I have here a picture of Chillicothe, showing the buildings that are completed, and here are the buildings that will be deferred. They can very well be deferred, but prison labor will be used in completing those buildings and beautifying the grounds.

Next, we come to the new hospital near Springfield, Mo. There, the citizens have donated a plat of ground valued, I believe, at \$135,000.

The authorization for that hospital was \$3,000,000. Later the appropriation limited it to \$2,500,000. It is a hospital for the mentally defective, the insane, the tubercular, the blind, the imbecile.

The contract was let last month; perhaps they have not started even yet on the building, and the contract allows four hundred and some odd days to complete it.

It was contemplated by the Budget estimate to put a tubercular hospital near by, with a bed capacity of 250 or more, at an estimated cost of \$250,000 or \$300,000. That is one item we left off, and we can discuss it when we reach the same.

The contract price for the buildings here shown on the map is \$1,710,000, and the architect's fees are about \$100,000. We have allowed an additional amount, the total, including previous appropriation, being \$2,025,000.

So we have deducted from the Budget estimate about \$500,000.

Mr. SABATH. Has the committee investigated whether this is a proper place for a tubercular hospital?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is one matter I want to bring to the attention of the House, when we come to that item, and the inquiry shows the great interest that the gentleman has in considering matters of this kind. It is a matter that I wish to call attention to later.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman sometime in his address give the total proposed cost of prisons, camps, and hospitals?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I shall be glad to insert that later. It depends upon whether this Congress approves our recommendation. I shall be glad later to insert it. There is another hospital over in Oklahoma. You see they are scattered around, and naturally it is but human that the people in the neighborhood are not very friendly to the idea of these reductions.

Mr. McCORMACK. All of this comes under Mr. Bates?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. He is a very fine gentleman.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; he is a very efficient official.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I might suggest to the gentleman that we are very glad in Nebraska that they did not place any of these prisons in our State.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Over in Oklahoma they are constructing what is supposed to be a duplicate of the Chillicothe prison, and it is intended largely to take care of that class of prison population from west of the Mississippi River. We have looked into that carefully and found that for \$225,000 out of the \$500,000 first appropriated for this prison the administration and detention buildings had been let. A balance of \$273,000 is left, and we appropriated only a sufficient amount to provide for a prison population of 600 in addition to what can be cared for in the detention building.

If later Congress finds it wise to expand this prison, it can be done with prison population. We have reduced the Budget estimate from \$1,850,000 to \$725,000 and have reappropriated the unexpended balance of \$273,000. This will give a very complete prison unit.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Will the gentleman advise whether or not the organic act for the construction of the institution in Oklahoma provided for the use of prison labor?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It did not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not all of the work on the institution in Oklahoma has been contract work?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The work that has been done, amounting only to \$225,000, I understand has been let by contract, but very likely the rest of this building program will be let by contract, since there are no prisoners there to do the work. We had the idea of building slowly, so that we could get a prison population there, and if later Congress found it necessary to expand, prison labor could be used.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Does the gentleman know of any other way we could use a part of the prison labor we now have at the industrial reformatory at Chillicothe and do more of the work there by contract, which would help the unemployment situation? This would give additional work for free labor.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think that he has made a more than liberal allowance for Chillicothe. I would like to have him use more prison labor there. I think it would be well within the authorization of Congress to do so.

Mr. PARSONS. About what is the penal population of all our prisons?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. We have 13,000 in the Federal prisons; we have about 11,000 in the State, county, and city jails; about 17,000 out on probation; and about 4,000 out on parole, making a total of approximately between 44,000 and 45,000 under all of those heads.

Mrs. ROGERS. Did not the committee have under consideration a Federal prison for Massachusetts within the last day or two?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No; not this committee.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What are the majority of the prisoners charged with that are in these Federal prisons?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman will find a full statement of that in the hearings. I am going to let the gentleman read about that up to 12 o'clock to-night because I shall refer him to the page later. All the information is there.

I want now to show another picture. We have more than 3,700 jails in this country, and the Bureau of Prisons has been inspecting these jails as rapidly as they could with the forces they have for the purpose of ascertaining whether they are suited for Federal prisons. They take into account, of course, safety, cleanliness, and health conditions, and the spots shown on this map which I now exhibit represent the prisons actually inspected. They number around 1,200. We have a prison population in these jails of approximately 11,000. That population varies, as I said, and the prison population trend is downward at present.

The inspectors are continuing their inspections, and they will add to the approved jails numerous others during the present fiscal year and during the fiscal year of 1933. That is another factor that entered into our recommendation that this heavy expense of building permanent prisons be deferred, and we have recommended very sharp reductions on that account.

Mr. PARSONS. About what is the total price per day paid for those in jail?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. They range from 59 cents to \$1.10, the average being around 75 cents. The building of these jails, as I stated in different sections of the country, has had this effect: That where the county, State, and city jails have at sometimes in the past been rather exacting when we were seeking entrance there for Federal prisoners, they now are willing to give us more readily the prices charged to States, cities, and counties.



The Federal jails have had a tendency to bring down prices. It is thought that in the year 1933 the price will average around 70 or 75 cents.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. KETCHAM. How does that average with the average price of maintenance in our Federal prisons?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That depends entirely upon the population. The smaller the population the greater is the cost in Federal jails, of course. As the population mounts, then, of course, the cost decreases. For instance, at Atlanta, where there are 3,600, the cost is around \$1,700,000.

At Leavenworth with 3,000 and Leavenworth annex with 1,800 it is \$1,800,000 plus. At the jail in New York with 180 prisoners, where there is also a school, the expense is relatively larger, because the population is smaller.

Mr. KETCHAM. Is the gentleman able to say whether or not it averages above or below 75 cents?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Where there is a population of around 600 I would say it may possibly be a little less, but where there is a smaller population, of course, it mounts up. There has to be guard attendance just the same, and the overhead is rather high.

Now, I have here an interesting map. It is illustrative of what I said in relation to the growth of the probation system. This part of the map represents what we had in 1926 and 1927, when we had an appropriation of \$50,000. The next year they carried still a large unexpended balance, and this territory was added to it. Then the following year we carried still an appropriation that was unexpended, and this territory was added. Then when we changed the law, authorizing the judges to appoint men of their own selection who were acquainted with the character of men whom they were willing to admit to probation, and we carried an appropriation of \$200,000, the green portion of the map represents how rapidly it spread, and this is when it went up from 4,000 to 17,000.

With the increase we have given there will be sufficient funds to provide a probation officer for all of the territory shown in white, which now represents districts not served by paid prohibition officers.

This is a social service, and we have not wanted in the slightest to discourage that very fine volunteer service that always has responded to the call of humanity, and oftentimes there is a strong human appeal to local organizations and to local individuals to come to the help of the unfortunate. The number of volunteer probation officers, serving without pay, of highest character, runs into the hundreds. We have felt we must not make this a real career job, as it were.

We thought we should provide fair compensation but nothing more, so there is carried a limitation fixing the highest salary that can be paid to a probation officer at \$2,600 and have suggested in our report that, taking into consideration the character of the probation officer, the number of probationers he will have to overlook, the extent of his territory, the character of the crimes, and so forth, the department should consider an initial pay of \$1,800, \$2,000, \$2,200, and \$2,400, leaving this to the discretion of the Attorney General.

Mr. HOCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. HOCH. Do the States shown in white indicate that the parole system has not been instituted?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The white portion shows where the parole system has not been instituted. There are some volunteers there, but there is no paid probation officer there, and there are comparatively few out on probation. The yellow portion represents the small increase for those lean years. These several colors represent step by step in years, and then the green represents when the law was changed and when the judges got behind it. Then the number rapidly increased from 4,000 to 17,000.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman say what the blue represents?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That only represents the increase from year to year. The different years are shown.

We went into the question purely for the purpose of calling to the attention of the Committee on the Judiciary, if it should have any occasion to make further judicial districts, that they should take into account the very large expense incident to holding courts at so many places, and we had a map prepared in order that we might make a study of it so that we might be able to conclude therefrom whether there was heavy expense incident to the great number of places at which courts are now held. Later I may advert to that. The committee had a supplemental hearing printed which will prove interesting. It was printed after the full hearings, and I invite the Members to get it.

Passing to the Department of Commerce, I have only discussed the outstanding matters under each head. I want to call your attention to some interesting maps from the Aeronautics Bureau in the Department of Commerce, and we will take up the other interesting items in the Department of Commerce under the 5-minute rule.

I have three maps here. All of these will be in the committee room for your information if you desire them. This shows that we now have 19,000 lighted airways, or will have at the end of the present fiscal year, in continental America. The radiobeacons are shown on this map, which gives additional information relative to the lighted airways. I will not have time to go into the situation in detail.

This also shows where all of the radiobeacons are and where the airports are. These three maps give fine information, and indexes are carried on each.

This map gives another picture of it with the intermediate fields and likewise the lighted airways. These maps will not appear in the Record, because it is impossible to place them there, but they will be in the committee room for the information of any Member.

Here are two maps in which you will be interested. This is Central America, and the black lines represent the American companies. You will see how we have taken over the air mileage in Central America.

The maps over here show all of the companies that are operating there, and you will find that the American Airways have 7,465 miles and another American company 2,295 miles. You see the strategic positions the American companies occupy. You find three routes leading from Cuba. Here is one coming over in this direction; here is another entrance, and here is another.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Why do we extend our air mail service over foreign countries when they do not extend their service over our country?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It was thought wise to do so. You might read the hearings on the Post Office bill and the other hearings which will be available later. I am simply bringing this to you for your information. This map shows South America, and you will see how American lines have circled it. These lines represent American companies.

I will not have time to go further into it, but each map is self-explanatory and will be found in the committee room.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. Is this done by negotiations between our Government and foreign governments?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think so. You would be surprised at the saving of time in communications between continental America and these countries. That all appears in the record. I can not go into those details, but we developed that very fully because we felt the House would be interested in such information.

Coming to the Department of Labor, I have only just a few minutes. I would like you to read the statement contained in the report made by the committee in reference to employment offices. We have approached this not in any controversial way but only for the purpose of laying it before the House as practical business men. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]



The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries: For Secretary of State, \$15,000; Under Secretary of State, \$10,000; and other personal services in the District of Columbia, including temporary employees, and not to exceed \$6,500 for employees engaged on piecework at rates to be fixed by the Secretary of State, \$1,915,540; in all, \$1,940,540: *Provided*, That in expending appropriations or portions of appropriations, contained in this act, for the payment for personal services in the District of Columbia in accordance with the classification act of 1923, as amended, with the exception of the four Assistant Secretaries of State and the legal adviser of the Department of State, the assistant to the Attorney General and six Assistant Attorneys General, the Assistant Secretaries of Commerce, the Assistant Secretary and the Second Assistant Secretary of Labor, the average of the salaries of the total number of persons under any grade in any bureau, office, or other appropriation unit shall not at any time exceed the average of the compensation rates specified for the grade by such act, as amended: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply (1) to grades 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the clerical-mechanical service, or (2) to require the reduction in salary of any person whose compensation was fixed as of July 1, 1924, in accordance with the rules of section 6 of such act, (3) to require the reduction in salary of any person who is transferred from one position to another position in the same or different grade in the same or a different bureau, office, or other appropriation unit, or (4) to prevent the payment of a salary under any grade at a rate higher than the maximum rate of the grade when such higher rate is permitted by the classification act of 1923, as amended, and is specifically authorized by other law, or (5) to reduce the compensation of any person in a grade in which only one position is allocated.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I trust that I am in no wise violating the proprieties or decorum that should obtain in the discussion of matters in the Committee of the Whole when I undertake in a few words to pay what I think is a most deserved compliment to the ability and industry of my distinguished colleague from Alabama, the chairman of this subcommittee [Mr. OLIVER]. [Applause.]

I do not undertake it in any sense of fulsome praise or flattery. I have often taken occasion to observe that probably the most laborious but nevertheless the most important work, particularly in times like these—and I say this without any invidious comparisons—that may be done by a Member of Congress is done in the Committee on Appropriations. The very nature of that work, the industry that is required, the persistence in the pursuit of legitimate details of information which should accompany the reports of the committee to the House and to the Committee of the Whole, involve an enormous amount not only of public responsibility but also of personal drudgery and detailed labor.

I happen to know that in this particular instance, because of my intimate touch and association with him, that my colleague for the last two months has not only been laboring with his associates—being charged with the personal responsibility of preparing this bill—but has worked many times until midnight in his home upon the details of this bill. I say, gentlemen, that not only the gentleman about whom I speak here to-day but all members of the Committee on Appropriations—and they are all thoroughly conscientious and devoted citizens of the Republic as well as faithful Representatives—deserve more praise, more honor, and more credit at the hands of their associates in this House than they receive.

I want to say that my friend from Alabama occupies a rather unique distinction in the political annals of my State. For 16 years he has been elected to the House of Representatives without opposition, either upon the part of his own party or on the part of the party in opposition. The last contest he had in politics was when, in my pride of opinion, I assumed to come to Congress from the same district in which we both then resided, and in the good judgment of the people of that district at that time it was decided that my colleague should come here to represent them instead of myself and that I should stay at home. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. May I say it was purely a deference to age at that time, and evidently there were some of our many mutual friends who felt that you might defer com-

ing for one year until the creation of the new district could be provided, which you have so ably represented since.

Mr. BANKHEAD. By the fortuities of politics, Alabama having gained an additional Representative and a new district having been created, I had the honor of being sent here to represent them; otherwise I fear I should always have remained a private citizen.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to compliment the legislature of Alabama for so wisely redistricting the State. [Applause.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, these remarks, of course, have taken a wider range than I anticipated when I rose. I trust I have the indulgence of the committee in having presented them, because I felt in this instance, as in many others upon the part of the Representatives upon the Committee on Appropriations, a just meed of praise and appreciation should be shown to our faithful servants upon that committee. [Applause.]

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. KETCHAM. Agreeing with what the gentleman has said concerning the fine spirit shown by the Appropriations Committee in bringing in these bills, does the gentleman not agree that there is likewise a fine opportunity for the Members of the House generally in these particular times to make a most careful study of all these various items, to the end that the economies that have been worked out may possibly be added to by the Members of the House?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Exactly; and my only regret is that my distinguished colleague did not make his explanation of the bill at the beginning of the discussion, when he would have had a fuller attendance on the part of the committee.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, of course, I appreciate the kind words of my good friend from Alabama, and in reference to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM], I would like to say this: The committee has no pride of opinion in its recommendations. We have made no arbitrary reductions, but feel good reasons can be offered for the reductions made, and we hope that the House will study the bill with a view of effecting, if possible, further savings. [Applause.]

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to join with my good friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] in saying a few kind words about the distinguished gentleman who now has charge of this bill. Of course, you know I refer to my good friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER]. We have been working together for the last 10 or 11 years, and I want to assure the House that the same unanimity prevails in that committee that has always prevailed there. The committee handling the appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor is doing its work with exactly the same spirit it has exemplified during all the years that have gone by, and I want to say to you that this time, perhaps, we have had the most exhaustive analysis of the bill that has ever been made.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] is entitled to a great deal of respect and a great deal of credit for the painstaking efforts he has made in order to dig down and get to the foundation of numerous appropriations.

Gentlemen, while I am on the subject, you will notice there have been increases during the past year in various lines in all of our bills. Sometimes Congress is charged with increasing appropriations, and I am going to call your attention to just one item to show you that it is not the Congress so much as it is the people back home.

Take, for instance, the one item for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, which started 10 or 11 years ago with a very small beginning. I think we sent out commercial attachés and trade commissioners to about 24 countries of the world. The response was immediate. There was only one of these commercial attachés or trade commissioners who fell down, and this was the man we sent to Athens, Greece. There was a reason for this. It was because Greece at that time was overrun by the Armenians, her finances were low, and she had no money to buy goods.



so nothing was done; but, gentlemen, the very next year we received one contract from Greece that alone amounted to \$25,000,000.

These offices then began to spread all over the world, because they were demanded in other countries. Our people doing business with these other countries demanded that we should have a commercial attaché or trade commissioner in these foreign countries to look after their business. So we began to expand gradually, with a few additional offices each year, until now we are in more than 50 countries of the world, and we are represented by one of the finest organizations that it is possible to build up.

Some may ask why we are continuing appropriations during these times that some call times of depression. The reason is simply this, gentlemen. No business man would let his selling organization go down for a short period of time because he was not getting business. We expect to get all of this business back some day, and the cost of this work in each individual country is small. Therefore, we are maintaining this organization all over the world, and we expect that some day it will be functioning just the same as it did two or three years ago.

This is just a sample of the various things that have been done, and I could call your attention to many other things that have come up in the same way.

The people come in here and demand these things. On one day before our committee we have had as many as 100 prominent business men attending a single session of the committee, and I remember that after we had gone along a while with our commercial attachés then the next demand was that we should have some commodity experts. Now, what is a commodity expert? He is a man who looks after a particular line of business, and it was desired to send such specially qualified men into various sections of the world where their intelligence, education, and knowledge were required, and very soon we found that everybody wanted expert trade commissioners. So we had to declare on the floor of the House that there would be no more commodity experts appointed and that the general trade commissioner must handle all kinds of special business.

Then after a while the offices here began to develop and there was pressure on Congress for the establishment of district offices.

You gentlemen know all about it. We had to yield to that pressure, and we established these offices in order to comply with their requests. It is up now to this House to curtail and turn over some of the offices into the cooperative offices. There will be no harm done, because merchants in some large cities of the United States prefer to operate under the cooperative system in their own building, in their own rooms, rather than to go around the corner and find an agent of the Foreign and Domestic Commerce. [Applause.]

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. May I add my sincere tribute to the ability, integrity, and long record of splendid public service of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER]. I was in the Department of Commerce in 1913, when Germany was spending more money in this country in New York City alone to get world trade than the United States was spending all over the world to get world trade. When our movement was started in this country to get world trade we found the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] was one of the best friends of that movement, and he aided materially in the splendid success we achieved, and which meant added prosperity.

The world trade in my own city before the depression took place aggregated \$335,000,000 per year. That is the amount of foreign money that entered into the district for our manufactured products. I got the Federal Commerce Department agency for Detroit in 1924, and one of the men who aided me in getting the appropriation was my good friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] assisted in a material degree. I got the item of \$15,000 first in the Senate and these two splendid gentlemen protected the appropriation when it came to the House.

We know now that a good part of our depression in the United States is caused by the loss of the world trade, and that practically the entire depression was caused by the World War, and the collapse of many countries of the world and the rebellions and revolutions in at least 25 important countries.

It was not so important to us when Spain collapsed, but it was important when Brazil, Argentina, and countries of that rank collapsed and staged revolutions, and especially when Germany collapsed.

Now, I have taken quite a part in the debates on appropriation bills on the automobile amendment. It is in this bill on pages 125 and 126. I want to say to the gentleman in charge of the bill, Mr. OLIVER, that I do think it was unfair in the consideration of the Interior Department bill to have the important debate on this unsatisfactory amendment between 5 and 6 o'clock in the evening. Members rush in impatiently to vote on the pending question and yell, "Vote!" "Vote!" "Vote!" and do not listen carefully to arguments, and some hardly know what the issue is. They want to get home in a hurry.

I had protested on two former occasions when it looked as if the vote on the auto amendment was going to take place about 5.30. I was asked not to talk on the measure, but I did talk, nevertheless; and when the vote came, it came about 5.30 o'clock. In the confusion the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] was trying to tell me that that one amendment that I was asking was already in the amendment to the bill.

I thought not, because the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] showed me a draft of the amendment, and the language protecting the field service was not in it at that time. It was added later, I learned.

The House tied the original auto amendment to the agricultural bill with only 34 votes, 9 per cent of the membership of the House. It was very loosely and incorrectly drawn, and would have done a tremendous amount of damage.

I protested against it vigorously and the Senate Appropriations Committee has stricken out the entire amendment from the agricultural appropriation bill.

That was what I wanted rather than have the badly worded bill, and the Senators of the committee should be most highly commended.

The House amendment would have deprived the Cabinet member of his automobile, and would deprive the President of the use of his automobile if the amendment were tied to the appropriation bill affecting the White House. It would wreck the field service, especially of the Bureau of Roads. I suggested that the House was passing the buck to the Senate, and asking them to write the language correctly. Of course, there was great objection to that, and somebody rose perfunctorily and said that this is a very intelligent body, and that there was careful consideration given that amendment, and perfunctorily got a great deal of applause for defending this dignified body. But the RECORD shows that I was absolutely correct, because when the amendment did go to the Senate and the Senators tried to juggle the language around, and they found that they could not, they threw out the whole amendment. Thus the Senate snapped the buck right back to the House. That automobile amendment is now cut off the agricultural appropriation bill.

My arguments were put before the House in some 8 or 10 short speeches under the 5-minute rule, because I had to get in under the 5-minute rule, not being able to get time otherwise.

I have three amendments that I think should be made to the clause in the pending bill on page 126. First let me say that a Cabinet officer will be allowed to use his automobile in the pending bill. But the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] questioned last Tuesday as to the Assistant Secretary's car, and I said that he would be prevented from using his automobile under the language as it now stands, and so would the Acting Secretary. Why not clear up the language as to Assistant and Acting Secretaries.



Two more amendments should go on that bill. One would raise the \$750 limitation and the other would strike out the word "exclusively."

Why do not the gentlemen on the Appropriations Committee submit to the House the facts and arguments and statistics which they said they have on this matter relative to the possibility of buying official cars in any State under \$750? The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] asked the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. DOUGLAS], who was defending the bill last Tuesday, where these statistics are and why the House is not given them, and the gentleman from Arizona did not answer satisfactorily. I showed conclusively, from the RECORD a few weeks before, that the Interior Department could not buy a closed Ford automobile, getting the big factory-reduction price at only \$488, and deliver it at Shoshone, Ariz., for a cost of less than \$753. The freight was too high and the cost ran \$3 over the \$750 limit. I asked the gentleman in charge of the bill to place before the House figures showing that they can buy a closed car at the lowest price, the cheapest car, in those remote regions for \$750, and I ask the very fair gentleman, Mr. OLIVER, to do that on this bill. Of course, my argument here is the same argument as the argument of the departments and the bureaus—that they find they have to pay over \$750 for the lowest-priced car in some regions when the freight is added. Moreover, they have found by much experience that in the heavy travel in the mountains a heavier, rugged, high-powered car is a better car—that is, a 3,000-pound car in about the \$1,000 class—and that it is really more economical and will last longer and be cheaper in the long run than the lowest-priced car. They buy the lowest-priced car in cases where it is more economical to operate it.

The second amendment I suggest is to strike out the word "exclusively." Gentlemen have written into the bill that the cars must be used exclusively on official business. That prevents the renting of a private car or the Federal employee's personal car in time of emergency, or when the official car is broken down, or in other cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. If the gentleman will submit to us the amendments he suggests, we will be glad to give consideration to the same.

Mr. CLANCY. Thank you most sincerely. Each of us wants to write the best legislation possible. With regard to the word "exclusively," I believe it prevents the Government from renting a car. In one agency of the Geological Survey they have four personal cars, which in time of emergency or rush of work they can use. What do you make them do in this case? You make them buy four official cars and keep them there until the time they may need them, and they might use them once a month or once only in three months. If you strike out the word "exclusively" you give those honest officials, and they are honest, an opportunity to rent a car at cheap rates. In this way you promote economy and not wastefulness of public moneys.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLANCY] is always interested in the automobile industry. If the conditions would permit, I would not object, but just now I myself have been devoting time and energy not to secure cars for Government employees but to secure food for the millions of unemployed. I think it would be better if we would devote our energies to relieve existing conditions.

I do not wish to say anything against the automobile industry; but because of the action taken yesterday, I am obliged to impose upon the House with these remarks. At about 5.15 o'clock yesterday afternoon the House adopted a unanimous-consent agreement whereby it will allow only

two hours of debate on the so-called prohibition question and the appropriations under this bill. Because of illness in my family I shall not be able to be here Tuesday. I was hopeful that at that time I would be in a position to demonstrate to the chairman of the committee that we could easily cut off in the interest of the Nation at least \$10,000,000 of these appropriations that go to enforce the prohibition law which everyone in the United States knows is nothing but a farce and will not and can not be enforced, because the people are opposed to enforcing it.

On the other hand, if I had time, I could show that if we would adopt same legislation, we could bring revenue into the United States Treasury closely approximating \$500,000,000 annually with a bill permitting the manufacture of 2.75 per cent beer by weight and the sale of the same in bottles only and taxing each bottle 3 cents per pint. This tax the people are ready, willing, and anxious to pay in contrast to the various industries which are opposed to any increase in taxes or to any tax that it has been proposed to put upon them to bring about an elimination of the billion-dollar deficit under this Hoover administration. But I do not have time, and I presume the committee has acted prudently and wisely in shortening the debate on that important question. I realize that nothing can be done in this House, anyway, and time is wasted, and we will not amend the Volstead Act or the prohibition act until after the next election.

After that election the people will have spoken, and then I am sure that the great majority of Members who will be elected to the House as well as to the Senate, and the President, who will be elected, will recognize the need of at least modifying the Volstead Act, thereby bringing about conditions which will reestablish confidence in the Nation and result in times better than those we have enjoyed in the last few years under this Republican administration.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I can not be here on Tuesday I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on this important subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, the Filipinos, like every other ethnological group, have an ardent desire to develop their racial culture and national institutions with a feeling of tranquillity, and free from foreign initiative, influence, or control. We are laboring under a basic and fatal delusion if we think we can suppress their national aspirations. Some would have us believe that permanent Hadean darkness will settle over the Philippines if we grant their petition for self-government. I can not share their gloomy forebodings.

The Filipino has in his soul the same hunger for freedom and the same passion for self-government that inspired our Revolutionary forefathers to cast aside the English yoke. Seemingly there were many convincing economic and political reasons why the thirteen American Colonies should remain under the shadow and protection of the British flag. It was argued that a republic would be economically impotent, unable to maintain a stable government, and because of its limited military strength it would be incapable of resisting foreign aggression, and would quickly and inevitably succumb to the military prowess of some mercenary and conquering European nation. But against these insidious appeals the Colonies stood adamant. Convinced of the rectitude of their purposes, confident of their power to maintain themselves as a self-governing state, and trusting in the bounty of an overruling Providence our constitutional fathers proceeded to build a republic that is the wonder of the world, and that has on sea and land demonstrated its prowess and divine right to live, flourish, and bless mankind.

In his aspirations for independence the vision of the Filipino is not clouded by delay and despair, nor are his hopes palsied by disappointment. He realizes that the race is not always to the swift nor the battle to the strong. He has put his hand to the plow and will not look back. In harmony with an ancient maxim he is plowing with such oxen as he hath. He has set out to achieve independence. This



purpose he will not forego. From this path he will not deviate. Knowing his cause is just, and that it must in the end prevail, he will not be goaded into rash or unwise action. He will not prejudice his cause by a resort to force or by any short cuts to the end sought to be accomplished. His appeal is to the mind, heart, and conscience of the American people. He will plead his cause in the forum of reason and common sense, relying on the same inherent, God-given, inalienable rights of man which we successfully invoked in our struggle with Great Britain for the priceless boon of self-government. By peaceful agencies the Filipino will come into his own, and at no far-distant day.

The argument that the Filipino will realize greater prosperity from trade and commerce and enjoy more rapid economic progress under the American flag does not and should not appeal strongly to the Filipino who feels within him the stir and passion for racial and national independence. It is unthinkable that they would barter their national birthright for commercial gain, freedom from responsibility, or racial subservience.

The Filipinos do not want amity and commerce at the sacrifice of freedom. The passion for independence is not confined to a few highly educated Filipinos. It has become a national aspiration. It has permeated all ranks and classes of the Filipino race like a visitation.

Of course, the new Filipino republic will encounter cross-currents and rip-tides in the early stages of its independent national life. It will have to elbow its way through the crowd of nations. Its toes may be trampled and its shins barked, but that experience came to our own Republic and every other self-governing nation. No nation comes to full stature without jostling, jolting, and bumping, and I am persuaded the Filipinos are prepared to take their part of the bumps that come with the responsibilities of independence and self-government.

According to Charles Dudley Warner, "There was never a nation great until it came to the knowledge that it had nowhere to go for help."

In the checkered destinies of this old world who will say Providence has not reserved for the Filipino an honorable, perhaps a glorious future?

Few regions have been more richly blessed by the Creator than the Philippines. Far removed are they from the sweep of the rude boreal blasts, and yet not under withering equatorial rays, a semitropical climate; a fertile soil that under the magic touch of industry readily responds with abundant harvests; coastal lands and mountain ranges; mighty forests; some mineral; countless harbors in which fleets may find refuge from Neptune's fury and ride at ease; fruits in abundance; other worthwhile natural resources and potential wealth; a safe distance from the continents, yet not outside the track of commerce.

In the orderly processes of creation, when God gathered together the waters under the heavens, the flower-bedecked, grace-crowned, sea-girt Philippines rose above the limpid, laughing waters and burst into bloom and beauty. Caressing waves reflected the splendor of scarlet clouds and amethyst skies, through which the King of Day, in his chariot of fire, pursued his majestic course and with his radiant beams gilding earth and firmament with heaven's alchemy.

Though richly endowed with all these present and potential resources, the Philippines can never reach their highest state of development as a dependency of the United States or of any other nation. There is something in being a citizen of an independent state that develops initiative, increases capacity, expands genius, amplifies patriotism, and in many other ways better qualifies and equips men for the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. If the American colonists had remained subjects of Great Britain, even under a grant of power almost equal to independence, they never would have made the marvelous progress and achieved the phenomenal results that came to them as citizens of our Republic.

I am a friend of the Filipino people, though they are strangers to me. I am bound to them by the divinely spun

and delicately adjusted ties of humanity and universal brotherhood. I would give them a place in the sun and in the circle of self-governing commonwealths. I am willing to share with them the blessings of self-government. I want them to have in their sun-kissed, sea-girt isle the same kind and degree of freedom that we Americans enjoy and which is the heritage and inalienable birthright of all mankind.

The independence of the Philippines is inevitable—just as sure as the return of the seasons; just as certain as the ebb and flow of the restless and resistless tides. An enlightened public sentiment in America, with the slow-moving but firm and inexorable finger of destiny, is now writing the declaration of Philippine independence. That independence will not be won by shot and shell; not by bayonets on sanguinary battlefields; not by the spilling of patriots' blood or the ravages of war, but it will come as the unconditional gift of the American people and in fulfillment of our national covenants. By the short-sighted policy of procrastination we may delay, but we can no more defeat the aspirations of the native inhabitants of the Philippines for independence and for a place in the sun than we can stay the sweep of the Gulf Stream or deflect it from the path in which immutable natural laws decreed that it should flow.

Many persons who have powerful business and financial connections, in their heart of hearts favor our permanent retention of the Philippines, but realize that it would be impolitic to frankly avow their program at the present time. Our pledge was made so recently, and has been relied on so confidently by our insular wards, that an unequivocal repudiation of this promise by our Government would shock the moral conscience of the Nation. So those who favor the policy of keeping the Philippines camouflage their real purpose by advocating postponement of action. They concede that we should at some time grant self-government, but they argue that the time is not ripe, and that the Filipinos must stand by and wait our own good pleasure and our own inerrable judgment as to when they are capable of managing their own affairs. With these men the time never will be ripe and the day will never come when they will admit the capacity of the Filipinos for self-government. Their plea is "not now but later," which, with many, means "not now and never." By constantly postponing action they hope to lull the Filipinos into inactivity and breach our national obligations. In the language of Macbeth they—

Palter with us in a double sense;  
That keep the word of promise to our ear,  
And break it to our hope.

Many who oppose early Philippine independence are following the laissez faire or "let-well-enough-alone" policy. They would have us delay a decision on Philippine independence for 10, 20, or 50 years. Of course at the end of either of these periods these parties, or those who belong to the same school of political thought, will favor further delay and want action postponed for another 10, 20, or 50 years. I repeat, the longer we delay settlement of the Philippine problem the more difficult its solution becomes and the more complications and dangers attend its settlement.

The feet of the Filipino are at the door of the temple of freedom. His hand is on the door latch, and he passionately desires to enter. Shall we liberty-loving, liberty-enjoying, liberty-blessed Americans deny him entrance to this temple and shrine where we pay our obligations to the goddess of liberty? Shall we declare that the blessings of self-determination and free government are not to be enjoyed by the Filipino, especially when he craves the exercise of these prerogatives in the far-off islands where he was placed by a benign Providence? By granting independence to the Filipino we will not in any degree reduce the quantum of liberty or the blessings of free government that we enjoy under our free institutions. We can enrich the Filipino without impoverishing ourselves. Why should we hesitate? There is but one safe, sane, and sensible way to solve the Philippine problem, and that is by withdrawing our flag and granting complete independence. [Applause.]



Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I take this occasion, Mr. Chairman, to call attention to a matter that I believe all Members ought to be warned of. My attention has been called to a number of letters received by Members of Congress from some of their constituents soliciting money for the promotion of a bill which it is stated is on file with the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and that I, as chairman of that committee, propose to hold hearings upon it at the next meeting of the committee. It provides for the improvement of waters around Long Island Sound principally, and for a bond issue. The letters are signed by a man by the name of Robert Wilson Jackson, who signs himself as secretary of the committee on Federal appropriations for improvement of rivers and harbors.

I wish to state that there is no such bill pending with that committee, nor has such a bill been introduced in Congress. In view of the fact that he describes the bill as carrying a bond issue, if such bill were introduced it would be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and not to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. [Applause.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### EXPENSES OF FOREIGN SERVICE INSPECTORS

For the traveling expenses of Foreign Service officers detailed for inspection while traveling and inspecting under instructions from the Secretary of State, \$15,000.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of trying to secure a little information.

I notice we are appropriating very large sums of money for Foreign Service, and I am wondering whether it would be possible for that Foreign Service to secure information for this House and for the country as to what extent foreign countries permit the vicious practice of short selling which is permitted in this country, a practice which is ruining and destroying our commerce—which has destroyed our commerce—and which brought about the closing of 2,300 banks last year.

There was a hearing on my bill before the Committee on the Judiciary prohibiting short selling, which I believe is a detrimental practice. I think it is a curse to the Nation. Naturally, the gentlemen who are living on the profits of short selling and who derive tremendous benefits from this infamous practice have sent here some so-called professors and experts to show that foreign countries allow this kind of gambling which, I have stated, is permitted on our New York and other stock exchanges. In view of the fact that it will take a few days or a few weeks before the bill will be favorably reported I believe it would be of interest and benefit to this House and to the Members if we could secure from these foreign representatives of ours a report as to what extent other nations tolerate this abuse.

I understand that President Hoover had Mr. Whitney, president of the New York Stock Exchange, as his guest in the White House a few days ago, whereupon Mr. Whitney issued a statement yesterday to the effect that the stock exchange is amending its rules to restrict short selling, the new rule going into effect April 1, 1932. What is the rule? The rule provides that after April 1 every broker must secure a permit from those who have bought stock on margin before he can loan the stock to those who are selling it short. This in no way will prohibit short selling, for very few of those who buy on margin will refuse to sign such permits, because they do not understand that by agreeing that the stock which they have bought can be loaned for short-selling purposes, they unwittingly sanction the use of their stock against their own interests. They do not realize that when they sign on the dotted line they are signing their death certificates, since this permits the brokers to loan the stock to the men who sold stock which they do not possess, thereby causing an immediate reduction in the prices of those very securities or stocks which these "lambs" authorized to be loaned.

I wish to say to Mr. Whitney that this will no longer fool the people. They are beginning to understand the destruction that short selling has caused. Neither will it stop the hearings that are now being held on short selling nor favorable action on the part of the committee, for I am confident that when I finish giving my evidence and complete my arguments, and regardless of Mr. Whitney's radio speeches, I shall have convinced the country with the need for this legislation.

In to-day's press President Hoover makes the following statement in regard to short selling:

I have a question from the press as to conferences held with officials of the New York Stock Exchange. There have been discussions, as is reported, between myself and other officials of the administration with officials of the New York Stock Exchange on the question of bear raids.

Stock-exchange officials have, during the past eight months, from time to time taken steps to restrain bear raiding with a degree of success, but during the latter part of January, despite these steps, there was a large increase in the short accounts, which unquestionably affected the prices of securities and brought discouragement to the country as a whole.

I and other administration officials again expressed our views to the managers of the exchange that they should take adequate measures to protect investors from artificial depression of the prices of securities for speculative profit. Individuals who use the facilities of the exchange for such purposes are not contributing to the recovery of the United States.

If the conditions brought about by short selling were not so serious, and if the country were not suffering therefrom to the extent that it now does, this statement of the President would be very amusing to me, for he has pleaded with the president of the New York Stock Exchange, Mr. Whitney, to stop these destructive—yes, criminal—activities on the exchange.

After the stock exchange refused to listen to my urgent pleas to stop short selling and save the country from destruction, I appealed to President Hoover to put a stop to this nefarious practice. I called his attention to the fact that if the board of governors of the New York Stock Exchange did not voluntarily restrict the practice, the Attorney General and the Postmaster General could force it to do so. For over two and a half years I have been asking the President to act, but instead of action I have received promises, which, however, were short-lived, on up to the time when the attorney for the stock exchange pointed out to him that the stock exchange and board of trade looked with disfavor upon his statement, made about a year ago, to the effect that the abuses of the stock exchange should be rectified. In that connection permit me to read and embody into the RECORD the following telegram and letter that I sent to President Hoover:

CHICAGO, ILL., November 12, 1929.

His Excellency HERBERT HOOVER,  
Washington, D. C.

To-day's press dispatches state that the professionals are still selling short. I am satisfied that this outrageous destruction of the small investors has gone far enough, and that immediate steps are needed to save the Nation from disastrous conditions that are bound to follow. It is the consensus of opinion of well-informed men that you, Mr. President, should call upon the financiers of this Nation to stop profiteering and formulate and carry out a plan to save the Nation from dire calamity.

A. J. SABATH.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C., October 16, 1930.

His Excellency HERBERT HOOVER,  
President of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A year ago, before the crash, I called your attention to the approaching alarming conditions, and advocated and pleaded for a cessation of the disastrous pool, short-selling practice.

Therefore I read with some satisfaction in to-day's press of a conference you held with the New York Stock Exchange officials regarding short selling and the investigation of stock-exchange transactions by the Department of Justice. The report indicates that they question the Government's power to stop this prosperity-destroying practice.

No one can successfully deny to-day that the stock crash, to which you alluded in your December message, was responsible for and aggravated the conditions that have brought about the wrecking of hundreds of banks and financial institutions, the closing of thousands upon thousands of businesses, the destruction of thou-



sands of factories and plants, thereby forcing out of employment millions of our citizens and causing untold want and misery.

It is known to be a fact that the New York Stock Exchange can curb short selling by the issuance of an order that all loanings and borrowings of stocks cease. This will bring short selling to a minimum. If the stock exchanges have any interest in the welfare of the Nation and in the reestablishment of confidence, they will, if not for the country's sake, then for their own sake, issue immediately such an order without questioning the power of the Government to stop this nefarious practice.

This in a great measure will eliminate uncertainty and will have a tendency to reestablish confidence, which is so sadly needed, for the resumption of the legitimate business of the country. Please be assured that my activity against these destructive shorts is prompted only by a sincere desire to improve the deplorable conditions of the Nation.

Permit me to remain, respectfully,

A. J. SABATH.

And, in addition, this telegram to the governor of the New York Stock Exchange:

CHICAGO, ILL., November 12, 1929.

THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS,  
The New York Stock Exchange,  
New York City, N. Y.:

To-day's New York press dispatches state that short selling is increasing. In view of conditions I express the opinion of many well-informed men that the board having power to stop all short selling should do so immediately, since the existing dangerous conditions demand such a step and may be helpful and beneficial to the entire Nation. Failure of the board to act may bring about conditions the seriousness of which no one can foretell and for which the board will be held responsible.

A. J. SABATH.

But these are not the only telegrams and letters I have sent to President Hoover and the officials of the stock exchanges. There were many others—some, in fact, much stronger—which at this time I will not read or have printed in the RECORD. However, with all of them I have not succeeded in making Mr. Whitney realize that his exchange must change its tactics and practices and give the people who insist on gambling—and that is all it is—a chance for their "white alley."

To-day I am satisfied in a measure that the President has at last pleaded with Mr. Whitney on his knees to issue some new order that would appease the public clamor against short selling. And their present actions indicate clearly that I was justified in my fight against this practice, which I began in 1929. They can no longer deny that short selling is detrimental to the economic and social life of the Nation and should be eliminated. That has been demonstrated and proven several times, and now it is acknowledged by them.

But if I were President I would instruct the Attorney General and the Postmaster General to proceed immediately against these racketeers, stop this infamous practice, and give the country a chance to reestablish the confidence that is so badly needed, for I am certain that so long as the practice of "bear raiding" continues the people who still have money will not attempt to invest it.

In the near future I shall give the House some real facts and the names of some of the outstanding financiers or manipulators who accumulated millions upon millions of dollars through short-selling activities at the expense of the Nation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has prompted me to say what I shall say at this time. I have the honor to be a member of the Committee on Agriculture. That committee has been conducting hearings for a number of days on the very question spoken of by the gentleman from Illinois. The committee has had before it the various heads of these exchanges, and I am very glad to say to the gentleman that in my opinion we are going to report some legislation very soon which he will most heartily indorse, according to the views he has expressed to-day.

It is my honest conviction, after having heard these hearings for a number of days, that short selling ought to be abolished.

The President of the United States called the attention of the public to these exchanges a short time ago as to what they were doing, and there was a department which

should have acted under the law. That department, however, took no action, but the fact that the President of the United States called attention to what they were doing did bring about some good. The short sellers for a few days went over on the long side; but, as a matter of fact, they were on both sides. I hope we can report some legislation in a few days which will not only permit the department to act in cases of this kind but which will go further than the stopping of it after it has started. I hope we can put some provision in the law that will authorize the department, when they know a thing of that kind is coming on, to take such action as will prevent it and punish those who engage in that practice.

There is no question but what the short selling of cotton, of wheat, and other products in a gambling way is a great detriment to those who produce those things. It is nothing but gambling, and it should be stopped. I have as much respect for a man who shoots craps as I have for the man who will take the cotton that a man grows by the sweat of his brow and short sell it in a way that will cause great loss to that man. Such men have no right to fix the price of those commodities before they go to the market.

I hope we will soon have an agency set up which will be able to handle wheat, cotton, and our other principal commodities without interference on the part of these exchanges. These exchanges could serve a good purpose. I have nothing against them as such, but whatever they do they should do in a legitimate way, but when they create conditions such as they have created in the past I say they are manifestly wrong.

The other day the head of one of these exchanges appeared before our committee, and I asked him how it was possible to tell 10 months ahead what a bale of cotton was going to be worth, even when the seed had not been planted. He said, "It is this way: Somebody will say, I would like to buy 10,000 bales of cotton in a certain month, and another man will say, I will give so much for it, and that fixes the price." He said, "That is a contract which is enforceable." But you and I know very well that it is only enforceable if the two men want to enforce it, but the fact is they never intended to enforce it when they engaged in it. That is what they are doing on these exchanges now, and I for one believe it ought to be stopped and that there should not be allowed to be any short selling of these commodities. Let them do a legitimate business and not do this other business. [Applause.]

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### RENT, HEAT, FUEL, AND LIGHT, FOREIGN SERVICE

For rent, heat, fuel, and light for the Foreign Service and the United States Court for China for offices and grounds, including annual ground rent of the embassy at Tokyo, Japan, for the year ending March 15, 1933, and, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 5, sec. 118a), for living quarters and for allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, \$2,017,709: *Provided*, That payment for rent may be made in advance: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of State may enter into leases for such offices, grounds, and living quarters for periods not exceeding 10 years: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light in an amount exceeding \$3,000 for an ambassador or a minister, and not exceeding \$1,700 for any other Foreign Service officer: *Provided further*, That under this appropriation and the appropriation for "Contingent expenses, foreign missions," or the appropriation for "Contingent expenses, United States consulates," not more than \$3,000 shall be expended for custodial service, heat, fuel, and light at any Government-owned building used exclusively for residence purposes for an ambassador or minister, and not more than \$1,700 for such purposes in the case of any other Foreign Service officer.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLIVER of Alabama: On page 13, beginning in line 22, strike out the word "exclusively," and in line 23, after the word "residence," insert the following: "or residence and office."

The amendment was agreed to.



The Clerk read as follows:

For participation by the United States in the Seventh International Conference of American States to be held in the city of Montevideo, Uruguay, including personal services without reference to the classification act of 1923, as amended, and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, stenographic reporting and translating services by contract if deemed necessary, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); traveling expenses and subsistence or per diem in lieu of subsistence (notwithstanding the provisions of the subsistence expense act of 1926 or regulations prescribed pursuant thereto, and by indirect routes if specifically authorized by the Secretary of State as necessary in connection with the work of the conference); hire of automobiles; purchase of necessary books and documents; stationery, official cards; newspapers and periodicals; printing and binding; entertainment; equipment; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State, including the reimbursement of other appropriations from which payments may have been made for any of the purposes herein specified, to be immediately available, \$80,000.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of directing an inquiry to the chairman of the subcommittee. Will the chairman of the subcommittee be kind enough to give the committee an explanation as to the purpose of this international convention? I may say in that connection that it seems to me that in view of the quite general feeling in the country at this time that we should scan these international items with some degree of care, and I am sure the chairman of the subcommittee is thoroughly competent to inform us. I for one would like to have a word of explanation as to this particular activity.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think the State Department is correct in stating that this is one of the most important conferences we hold, and it is hoped to send a very representative delegation to Montevideo, because through conferences of this kind we maintain cordial and friendly relations with all of the countries to the south of us. The department, naturally, is very much interested in this appropriation. The committee has carried what it felt was a sufficient amount for the expenses of the delegation.

Mr. KETCHAM. I notice that the amount requested by the Budget has been reduced by \$40,000?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. May I inquire how frequently these conferences are held?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. These conferences are held, I think, every three years. The last was the conference held in Cuba, as the gentleman may recall.

Mr. KETCHAM. I do.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. They hold them at certain stated intervals and, as I have said, the State Department considers this one of its important conferences.

Mr. KETCHAM. The whole purpose is to maintain the fine relationship which exists between our own country and the countries to the south of us?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. There are many important questions considered at these conferences.

Mr. KETCHAM. Do those discussions cover the whole range of our relationships, economic and otherwise?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I am so informed.

Mr. KETCHAM. There are no particular obligations, other than those of good will, that grow out of these conferences?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. None whatever, and the gentleman will find a very interesting statement submitted by Assistant Secretary Carr, under this item, in the hearings.

Mr. KETCHAM. I shall read it with much interest, but it seemed to me that in view of the importance of this item, and a number of others as to which I wish to direct inquiry, there should be a brief statement for the purpose of the RECORD, and I have made the inquiry for that reason and not for the purpose of questioning the appropriation.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I am pleased to have the gentleman call attention to the item.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of international arbitration, \$6,000; and in addition the unobligated balances of the appropriations "Bureau of Inter-

parliamentary Union for Promotion of International Arbitration, 1932," and "Expenses, American Group of the Interparliamentary Union, 1932," are hereby reappropriated for this purpose.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLIVER of Alabama: On page 19, in line 5, strike out \$6,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$7,289.21.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this is an appropriation in which the Members of Congress have been very much interested for some years, and members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs have recently discussed it with me.

I offer this amendment for the purpose of correcting a mistake made by the Assistant Secretary of State in stating to the committee that there was an unexpended balance of \$4,000.

It was the purpose of the committee to appropriate a sufficient sum which when added to the unexpended balance would make the \$10,000. The Assistant Secretary of State later informed me he was in error in stating that the unexpended balance was \$4,000. The amendment increases the amount of \$6,000 so that with the unexpended balance there will be \$10,000 available, which is the sum recommended by the Budget.

Mr. KETCHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. With reference to this particular item, will the gentleman take two or three minutes to give for the RECORD an explanation of this item, so that those who may desire can have a place to which they may turn and find a statement as to the activities of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The gentleman will find the activities set out on page 235 of the hearings.

Mr. KETCHAM. The trouble is that while the hearings are available for the Members—

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. And I will ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM], in the absence of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE], to make a statement as to the importance of these annual meetings. A number of our Members have attended meetings of the Interparliamentary Union, and I think the gentleman's question is very timely. The committee would like to have a report from some one who has attended some of the meetings, and I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] has.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, responding to the suggestion of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations [Mr. OLIVER], I will say it was not my privilege to attend the conference of the Interparliamentary Union last year. We had one meeting in Washington in 1925 in this Chamber. The Interparliamentary Union, in fact, grew very largely out of activities of the Congress of the United States. It was a forerunner, and I think it may fairly be said that the Union was the original creative power, of the Permanent Court of Arbitration at The Hague, created in 1907.

Former President Roosevelt, in his lifetime, took particular interest in the Interparliamentary Union. It is a voluntary body which, of course, can not impose, and does not attempt to impose, any obligations on the governments of the world, but provides a place and a time when representatives and delegates from all the parliaments of the earth may have an opportunity to meet for consultation and discussion. Its main purpose has always been the promotion of peace.

During the World War it naturally fell into desuetude and no meetings could be held, but since the World War the Union has attracted a great deal of attention, and I think it is now the one organization to which we in the American Congress may turn for some kind of cooperation with other nations in maintaining amicable and friendly relations, not of a political but more of a personal and a parliamentary character.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.



Mr. TILSON. Is there any sum here appropriated for the individual expenses of members attending the Union?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Apparently not in this item.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No.

Mr. TILSON. Has it not been customary for at least a portion of the expenses of the members attending to be appropriated for?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. That has been done during the last few years, and I understand there is a bill now coming from the Committee on Foreign Affairs which will authorize such an appropriation. I presume if and when that bill passes it would be considered—

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama (interposing). There is no authorization at this time for the appropriation of any money for that purpose, and I will state that Governor MONTAGUE, who is president of the organization at this time, was suddenly called from the Chamber on account of illness in his family, or he would have been here to make a statement as to the importance of this appropriation.

Mr. TILSON. May I ask one further question as to how the Members who are to have their expenses paid, or partially paid, are selected?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. They are appointed by the president of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union. The president of that group now is former Governor MONTAGUE, of Virginia, a distinguished Member of this House. For many years the president of the American group was the Hon. Theodore Burton. Prior to that time the president of the American group was the late Senator William B. McKinley.

I may say that the Members of the House have received notice of a meeting of the American group of the union, to be held in the committee room of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads of the House on the 24th instant, and it is hoped that Members of the House and of the Senate will avail themselves of the opportunity to attend the meeting.

A new set of by-laws will be presented at that time which will differ somewhat from those previously existing, and Members will be interested in ascertaining the purpose and past activities of the group at that time.

These by-laws make all Members of the House and Senate ipso facto members of the group. If any Member does not care to be considered a member, provision is made for withdrawal. There are no obligations in a pecuniary way.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Is there any report made on the proceedings of this group?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. My understanding is that the report has been filed here and inserted in the RECORD as to the meeting held last summer.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I wish there was some way that some gentleman, a member of the group, could give us, in a speech on the floor, the purposes and what has been accomplished by this group. I hope it will be done, because a good many questions might be asked as to what has been accomplished and what is the relationship between our country and other countries. As one Member, I think it would be beneficial to have information along those lines.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think it was the purpose of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] to deliver a speech of that kind.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. During the last year I have been a member of the executive committee, but I am not an officer. However, I am quite certain that in the early part of this session of Congress there was inserted in the RECORD a report of the meeting held during the previous year. I can not at this moment state where that report may be found. It happens that I have been much interested and somewhat active in the work of the group, but our efficient president, Governor MONTAGUE, has handled its affairs, and I have not found it necessary to keep in close touch with the official activities of the group.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Members frequently are asking about this Interparliamentary Union, who are the delegates, how they are appointed, and they would be interested in an explanation of the accomplishments of the group, its purpose, and I think it would be interesting and beneficial.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I know that pamphlets have been sent to Members of the House and the Senate containing reports of the conferences of the union, but, like so many other reports that come to our desk, they frequently are overlooked.

Mr. KETCHAM. I am wondering in that connection if it would be in order to have the remarks made by the president of the International Parliamentary Union, Governor MONTAGUE, inserted in the RECORD at this particular point.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I do not think that would be wise. It would be more appropriate and more beneficial to have it made a public document. I do not think it ought to be put in the RECORD, for that would defeat the very purpose we have in mind.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Let me say that it happens, unfortunately, that Governor MONTAGUE is absent from the Chamber because of the illness of a member of his family. I shall undertake to ascertain whether it is possible to obtain any material of the kind the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KETCHAM] mentions and insert it at this point, if that can be done.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. I hope the gentleman will not ask it to be extended in the RECORD. Many of us have been asking for detailed information, and it ought to be given on the floor, where some of us can ask questions.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I am practically a volunteer in this matter.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Let us hold the matter up until we can see Governor MONTAGUE.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I am in thorough sympathy with the position taken by the gentleman from Oklahoma. I shall request the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] to arrange to make a statement to the House and give notice in advance.

Mr. KETCHAM. That would be entirely satisfactory to me, because some reference will doubtless be had in his remarks to the proceedings to-day, so that we may be able to locate them. The great difficulty I find is in being able to locate material quickly, which I desire to have when an inquiry arises as to a particular point under discussion. My purpose in rising at this time was to see if something could not be arranged while this item was under consideration.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Then I shall consider myself relieved of the task of having remarks extended in the RECORD.

Mr. KETCHAM. As far as I am concerned, that is satisfactory. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURE AT ROME, ITALY

For the payment of the quota of the United States, including the Territory of Hawaii, and the dependencies of the Philippine Islands, Porto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, for the support of the International Institute of Agriculture for the calendar year 1933, \$5,400.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In 1849 David Lubin was born in Poland of Polish parents. His father died in London when David was two years of age. He came with his remarried mother to the United States. He worked in a jewelry factory at Attleboro, Mass., and then drifted to Sacramento, Calif., where he first worked as a laborer, and having earned a little money, he became a merchant, dealing largely in overalls. He came in contact with farmers and learned their problems. He acquired a little farm and became interested in growing fruit and vegetables, in the meantime continuing his mercantile operations. He had a great mind and a great heart. He used the intellectual powers with which he was endowed in a manner helpful to his fellow men.

He was the originator and founder of the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome. He interested Victor Emanuel, King of Italy, in the project, and the King donated a building for headquarters of the institute and pledged \$60,000 annually for the maintenance of the institute. The first meeting was held in 1905, 40 nations being represented.



Lubin was appointed a delegate to this first meeting by President Roosevelt. He died in Rome in 1919, after living to see 53 sovereign nations participating in the activities of this institute.

The institute collects and disseminates information relating to agriculture in practically every nation on earth. It consists of four bureaus:

1. Bureau of the secretary general.
2. Bureau of general statistics.
3. Bureau of agricultural intelligence and plant diseases.
4. Bureau of economics.

It investigates crop and market conditions throughout the world, disseminates information, and keeps the agricultural classes in every nation informed and advised in relation to matters affecting the interests of agriculture. It was Lubin's dream to found an institute that would enable farmers on one side of the globe to know what farmers on the other side of the globe were producing and at what cost. His dream was realized, and he lived to see this institute firmly established and efficiently functioning as a worthwhile aid to the agricultural classes in every land.

Here is a benevolent activity that the American people know but little about, and yet it is rendering them a very valuable service. Some of the most valuable agricultural statistics in relation to crop and market conditions abroad come not from our Department of Agriculture but from the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, founded by the genius of this Polish Jew. He not only gave the world this institution, but he served his day and generation in many other ways. He introduced the rural credit system in the United States. He was largely responsible for the extension of the parcel post to farmers. He promoted the plan of direct buying and selling of agricultural products through the mails. He organized some of the first and most successful farmers' cooperative associations. He was a pioneer in our national marketing activities, based on the German Landwirtschaftsrat.

It is proper for us to pause at the conclusion of the reading of this paragraph to pay a tribute of respect to this public benefactor and call the attention of the Nation to the very valuable services rendered by this Jewish immigrant, not only to the people of America but to the people of the world. As a result of his vision, genius, and indomitable activity, this International Institute of Agriculture is serving not only the United States but serving 52 other commonwealths of the world. His successful life and accomplishments demonstrate that genius is not limited by national or racial lines and that under our benign governmental institutions the humblest man, though a penniless Polish immigrant, may rise above his environment, attain distinction, acceptably serve his day and generation, and earn a place in history and in the affections of a grateful people.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOZIER. Yes.

Mr. KETCHAM. The gentleman stated a moment ago that the statistics coming to us in respect to agriculture as a result of the institute at Rome are more valuable than those gathered by the Department of Agriculture here at home. That might have been true in the earlier days; but has the gentleman given very careful attention to the statistics that have come in the last year or two, since we have established our foreign offices of the Department of Agriculture, which, by the way, were the direct outgrowth of this very movement?

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, the statement of the gentleman from Michigan is correct. Until a few years ago practically all of the statistics we had as to crop production and market conditions abroad came to us through the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome; but, as the gentleman says, in the last year or two we have been getting many valuable statistical data direct from foreign representatives of our Department of Agriculture.

The Clerk read as follows:

For participation by the United States in the Conference for Revision of the International Radiotelegraph Convention of No-

vember 25, 1927, to be held in Madrid, Spain, including personal services, without reference to the classification act of 1923, as amended, and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, stenographic reporting and translating services by contract if deemed necessary without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5); traveling expenses and subsistence or per diem in lieu of subsistence (notwithstanding the provisions of the subsistence expense act of 1926 or regulations prescribed pursuant thereto); hire of automobiles; purchase of necessary books and documents; stationery; official cards; newspapers and periodicals; printing and binding; entertainment; equipment; and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State, including the reimbursement of other appropriations from which payments may have been made for any of the purposes herein specified, to be immediately available, \$90,000.

Mr. KETCHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. In line with the questions propounded concerning some other international items, will the gentleman from Alabama take a moment or two to explain this one, which seems to be relatively new? I think a statement should be made in the Record in regard to this expenditure, which seems rather large.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. One of the conventions was held in Washington, and the one for which this appropriation is carried is considered very important. Many questions will be discussed and acted on that might be very prejudicial to our own country, if the action was unfavorable to us. Senator WHITE, who was the former chairman of the legislative committee, and, I think, Mr. DAVIS, the present chairman of the committee, have both expressed great interest in this appropriation being carried. Of course, all they wanted was to get a sufficient amount to insure a representative delegation. The gentleman will find a very interesting statement by Senator WHITE in the hearings relative to this matter.

Mr. KETCHAM. The urgency for it is because of the rapid development in this field and our leadership in it?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. We are simply compelled to have international understandings with reference to this matter; otherwise they could absolutely destroy the rights of this country in the air.

Mr. KETCHAM. That is to say, unless we are in on the conference, radio stations might be established immediately adjoining the boundaries of the United States and interfere with and possibly destroy our activities in that respect.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Unquestionably so.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For annual contribution toward the support of the Somerset Hospital (a foreign hospital), at Cape Town, \$50, to be paid by the Secretary of State upon the assurance that suffering seamen and citizens of the United States will be admitted to the privileges of said hospital.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to ask the Chairman to explain this item. I do not see why there is only \$50 appropriated to one foreign hospital for suffering seamen and citizens.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is a treaty obligation.

Mr. GOSS. And that occurs only in this one country, Africa?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; that is the only one.

Mr. GOSS. How is it taken care of in other countries?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I am not prepared to state about any other countries, but this is the only contribution we are required to make to any hospital by treaty in this bill.

Mr. GOSS. It is just a gratuity, and for that they agree to take in our seamen?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. What happens to our seamen and citizens in other countries?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Well, we have another fund for that, and any consul is required to send them back home and to find work for them on the returning ships, if possible.

Mr. GOSS. I was wondering why we singled out Cape Town, Africa.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. There happens to be a hospital there, and under a treaty we make this contribution for its maintenance.



Mr. GOSS. And that is the only one we make?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The only one I know of.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Convention relating to the liquor traffic in Africa: To meet the share of the United States in the expenses for the calendar year 1933 of the Central International Office, created under article 7 of the convention of September 10, 1919, relating to the liquor traffic in Africa, \$55.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Has the chairman any explanation of the \$55 contribution to a country, relating to the liquor traffic in Africa? What is that item?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It is a treaty obligation.

Mr. GOSS. We are interested in liquor in Africa?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No. This appears in the hearings:

A central international office for the repression of the slave trade was established in Brussels, Belgium, under the general act of Brussels of July 2, 1890, to which act the United States was a signatory power. This central office dealt with the question of the traffic in slaves, arms and ammunition, and spirituous liquor in Africa.

Then the provision of the article is given. This is a treaty obligation.

Mr. GOSS. But it says in the bill, relating to liquor traffic in Africa, \$55, but it does not mention slavery, and so forth. Are we putting all the money now into prohibition problems of Africa?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It just happens to be carried that way by the State Department and has been carried in that form for a number of years.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I want to bring to the attention of the membership of the House some good, sound Hearst doctrine, in view of the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] yesterday praised certain views of Hon. William Randolph Hearst. I want to read into the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Times, one of the Hearst newspapers, issued February 19, 1932, which reads as follows:

MILLIONS FOR PROHIBITION "ENFORCEMENT"—NO SAVINGS PERMITTED THERE

Fanaticism or stupidity—or both—reach a climax in the decision of the House Appropriations Committee that no cut shall be made in the funds for prohibition enforcement, though the funds for every other branch of Government are being drastically scaled down.

As a sample of sheer idiocy we commend the committee report to our readers.

The committee says:

"This is the only item about which there was disagreement. Two members felt that the amount should be reduced. The majority, however, felt that as this appropriation is for the enforcement of a law which presents unusual difficulties at times in its enforcement the appropriation should not be reduced."

We wonder at what time the enforcement of the law does not present unusual difficulties.

We wonder at what time the enforcement of the law is not 99 per cent impossible.

If the committee will clear that point up for the country, it will perform a public service.

The country is under the impression that anybody can get a drink if he wants it, and the country happens to be right.

However, the appropriation was reported favorably, and no doubt will be authorized by the House.

In this same bill which makes the next fiscal year safe for Mr. Woodcock and his 2,000 agents the fund for the establishment and maintenance of the Department of Commerce airways was slashed \$1,500,000.

That stroke of "economy" will prevent any extension of the existing lines for a year and will be a severe setback to the established airways, over which more than half of the Nation's air mail is carried at night.

The Army and Navy, which are vital to the Nation's safety, have been reduced already to a point where it is doubtful if they can perform their mission.

All civil employees of the Government, except the prohibition agents, face the prospect of a pay cut which, if made, will encourage every private firm in the land to follow suit—thereby reducing the public's buying power still farther.

Yet the holy work of closing up a few night clubs and nabbing a few small-fry bootleggers must go on. There must be no scrimping or saving there, no matter how vast the deficit may grow.

You can understand now why Will Rogers, in a candid moment, referred to his native country as "Cuckooland."

If this is a fair sample of the way we manage our affairs, Mr. Rogers paid us too big a compliment.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHAFER. I yield.

Mr. GOSS. We are right at that point in this appropriation bill now, where we are appropriating \$55, relating to the liquor traffic in Africa.

Mr. SCHAFER. Oh, that is merely a drop in the bucket when compared with the total amount provided for prohibition in the pending bill. It is rather remarkable that the economy experts of the Democratic Party, led by the honorable Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. DOUGLAS], have allowed their eagle eyes to pass over the expenditures in the Prohibition Department when they are continually asking for a reduction in appropriations of other branches of the Government. The editorial I have just read hits the nail squarely on the head. I can realize the attitude of these gentlemen, because the facts in their records do not indicate that they are for rigid economy. In the Seventieth Congress, second session, three of these four horsemen, the gentleman from Tennessee and the two gentlemen from Texas, who are now leading the Democratic economy-propaganda agency, voted to foist upon the President of the United States \$24,000,000 for prohibition enforcement, in addition to the regular appropriation, without having estimates or a request for that amount from the department or from the President. So we can not consider all of the present Democratic economy war cries for political effect as positions of those who really want to balance the Budget and reduce the cost of government. Let me suggest to the gentlemen that if they desire to balance the Budget, repeal the prohibition monstrosity and save many millions of dollars in enforcement each year, and enact a bill taxing alcoholic beverages and put four or five hundred million dollars in the Treasury each year, which will help balance the Budget. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from Wisconsin would not knowingly violate the spirit of an agreement, and I am sure the gentleman was present when I stated to the House the substance of an agreement had with Representatives on both sides of the aisle, in reference to the prohibition amendment. It was that all discussion of the prohibition item and all amendments thereto should be limited to two hours on Tuesday, on which date, if reached, it would be passed. I hope that all Members will observe the agreement. I acquit the gentleman from Wisconsin from any violation of it, because I assume the gentleman did not know of the agreement.

Mr. SCHAFER. The gentleman from Wisconsin was not present in the Chamber at the time. He was very busy going over a transcript of the hearings conducted by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on the bill to consolidate the Army and Navy.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I acquit the gentleman absolutely of any conscious violation, even of the spirit of the agreement, and am simply calling attention to it in order that we may hereafter defer all discussion of that part of the bill until next Tuesday.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOSS. In view of the gentleman's remarks, does he not think that this particular paragraph might come within that prohibition, where it relates to the liquor traffic in Africa? That might also go over until Tuesday for a vote.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. This is a treaty obligation. I felt we had entered into a very fair agreement, satisfactory



to both sides, with a view of enabling many Members to make other engagements and not be here to-day.

Mr. GOSS. If the gentleman thinks it more of a treaty than a prohibition question, I withdraw my parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order. I am told that an amendment is to be offered to strike out certain provisos on page 121, and I would like the privilege of addressing the committee for five minutes in that connection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I merely desire to call to the attention of the committee the fact that on Tuesday or Wednesday an amendment will be offered, or a number of amendments will be offered on both sides of the committee, to strike from this bill the two provisos at the bottom of page 121. The two provisos are aimed at the United States Employment Service, which I contend, as one Member of the House, has been doing and is doing a very valuable public service. If the two provisos do not completely annihilate the United States Employment Service, they are a mistake, because I think that is what they are intended to do.

In the first place, the proviso reduces the salaries of 119 field employees, reducing their salaries anywhere from 10 to 50 per cent. I think that is wrong at this time. We need all of the virility and enthusiastic support in the Employment Service that it is possible to get, and I do not think that wages in employment's interest should be reduced at this time. There is another proviso to the effect that after a certain date no employment office shall be maintained where it is necessary to pay rent for the office. I have checked over the office rents, and I find that they run anywhere from \$25 a month to \$70 or \$80 a month. Most of them pay \$300 or \$400 a year under a lease.

To suggest to the Employment Service that it go to a Federal building, to an American Legion post, or to a State employment office and there find desk room in order to do the very valuable work it is doing and is expected to do at this time, when unemployment is at its height, I think is a wrong policy and can only be directed at the destruction of the whole service, which, under a man by the name of John M. Alpine, has done remarkable work and has a record which establishes a very high mark for Government service.

I will say to gentlemen on the floor that I do not even know the name of the man who is the director or manager of the employment office in my district, or in the city of Chicago. It is not in my district at all. I give you my word of honor that I do not know his name or where his office is. I do not know what salary he is getting. But my thought is that at this time, when we are not cutting salaries, when we are not cutting our own salaries, why should we single out these 119 men in this important service and reduce their salaries, unless it is to destroy the value of their positions entirely? If the subcommittee reporting this proviso wants to annihilate completely that bureau, why not take the \$802,000 which is carried in this bill and wipe it out of existence? Either the Employment Service is good or it is bad. If it is bad, it should be discontinued. I have every regard for the convictions and opinions of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER]. We have served together in this House for 20 years, a large part of that time on one committee. I regard his opinion highly; he is honest, capable, courageous, and a straight shooter. If he wants to annihilate this Employment Service, let him come upon the floor and tell us why it should be discontinued and make a motion to strike out the \$802,000 and save that amount for the Treasury. That is the proper way to reach this situation. But I contend it is a valuable service. I contend that John Alpine is making a great record for himself and for the service. The report which he submitted to the Subcommittee on Appropriations showed that during 1931

they found some 700,000 placements, as they are called—jobs for people. If they can do that, I do not think this is the time to suggest a reduction in their already small salaries or that they can only do business where they can get rent free, especially when you take into consideration the fact that they are only paying from \$25 to \$80 a month.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRITTEN. I hope when the amendment is offered on the floor next Tuesday to strike out those two provisos, it will prevail. Such action will be in the interest of good, sound business economy. At a time like this we should not do anything to damage a valuable service in a false interest of economy.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there is a proviso on page 63 with reference to district offices. I hope the gentleman will include that in his amendment.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be proper at this time to read what my limited time this morning would not permit me to do before the bill was taken up under the 5-minute rule. I wish to read the committee's report, not for the purpose of making at this time any comment thereon, but simply that this statement by the committee may appear in the RECORD before the item is reached. The statement reads:

It will be recalled that this appropriation was first carried during the closing years of the war, and the money then appropriated was used to find workers for jobs. Later, as the annual appropriations were greatly reduced, the activities of this service were largely confined in providing laborers to meet the seasonal demands of the farmers of the West, Southwest, and Mid West. The appropriation is now employed in the effort to find jobs for the unemployed. Naturally this purpose makes a very strong human appeal to Members of Congress. Just before the holidays \$120,000 additional was carried as a deficiency appropriation on the urgent request of the department. At that time the Secretary of Commerce and the Director of the Employment Service stated to the committee they would not ask that the Budget estimate for 1933—which carried less than was regularly appropriated for 1932—be increased. They made the further statement that it was not contemplated paying salaries at any new office to be established in excess of \$2,000. Congress, it will be recalled, placed a limitation to this effect on the appropriation, and this bill carries a similar limitation as to all salaries at employment offices after the beginning of the next fiscal year, and also a further limitation against the payment of any rents.

The only reduction which the committee has made in the amount as recommended by the Budget is in the item of rent, resulting from the limitation just referred to, and reflecting a saving if the rent limitation is approved.

There are members of the committee who believe, however, that additional and substantial reductions should be made in this appropriation, yet since the House has recently favored a deficiency appropriation the committee feels that further reductions in the Budget estimate should be left to the determination of the House. The hearings carry a very informing statement from the capable director of this service, to which the attention of the Members is invited.

Though this report from the director shows outstanding accomplishments, yet it must be remembered that this is a social service where splendid and helpful cooperation is extended by chambers of commerce, civic, charity, and welfare organizations, and it is the thought of the committee that after July 1, 1932, all the communities throughout the country will be sufficiently stimulated to take over and care for, in a very large way, the purposes sought to be accomplished with this appropriation.

The attention of the House is especially called to the splendid work of the Legion in this connection and to the practical plans formulated and effectively carried out by volunteer organizations in the city of Rochester and the county of Monroe, N. Y., where the slogan seems to be, "We must and will find every possible job that our people can provide for the unemployed." This plan, we are glad to note, is being rapidly extended to other communities. It is the thought of members of the committee that there must be a limit placed on the time when large appropriations of this kind can be effectively used, and the splendid efforts that volunteer organizations throughout the country are now putting forward have led us to conclude that some substantial reduction in this appropriation may be made after July 1, 1932.

It will be noted from the hearings that the number on the pay roll under this appropriation is rapidly increasing in every State, and we recognize this presents difficulties, based on human equa-



tions, that may make it hard to reduce this appropriation, but may we not hope that such difficulties are more apparent than real.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. I have read that statement. The difference between the statement and the facts is that the statement refers to new field positions carrying a salary not in excess of \$2,000, while the language in the bill reduces the salaries of the 119 men who are already in the field. There is a great difference. If the gentleman's proviso in the bill is to care for new employees, that is one matter, but the bill actually reduces the salaries of 119 men already employed.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I am sure the gentleman can not complain when I am willing that the very persuasive speech that he is always able to make shall now remain with the committee without any reply other than the report of the committee, until taken up later. I am willing to wait to present the committee's views when the item is reached.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For salaries and expenses in connection with the supervision of the maintenance and care of United States prisoners, including not to exceed \$199,240 for personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling expenses, and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of such bureau when authorized by the Attorney General, \$239,650.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if there are any changes in the amounts provided for with respect to the items just read by the Clerk under the Bureau of Prisons?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; there is a reduction under the Budget estimate of \$16,000.

Mr. DYER. May I ask the gentleman what that reduction is?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. They wanted a farm supervisor at \$4,600; there were one or two clerical employees asked for, and I think there were two additional jail inspectors requested, and we denied all of the new employees.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman and his committee, I take it, felt this was justified, of course, or they would not have taken such action?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes. At every prison they have a farm superintendent and assistant, and we did not believe at this time we should provide for a new position carrying a salary of \$4,600 to travel out of Washington. The Department of Agriculture lends helpful assistance at any time through its many agents scattered throughout the country.

Then with respect to the jail inspectors, they now have six, and we did not feel they should have two additional. In reference to the clerical help, I recognize the work of this department is heavy, but so is that of Members of Congress, and they now have a very ambitious organization. There are 65 in the District and the salary roll is about \$195,000.

I can go more fully into the matter if that is desired, but the committee felt fully justified in denying the increases.

Mr. DYER. The Bureau of Prisons, of course, was recently established by the Congress and had for its purpose a more efficient administration of the prisons.

I would like to ask the gentleman as to his judgment of the effect of the change that Congress made.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It has been very beneficial. I think the director of the bureau, Mr. Bates, for whom I have the highest regard, is very capable and has accomplished a wonderful work.

Mr. DYER. I am very glad to have that judgment from the gentleman from Alabama touching the director of the bureau, because at the time he was selected a very careful survey of the whole country was made to find the man best fitted for this special work.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Every member of the committee was favorably impressed by the report of Mr. Bates.

Mr. DYER. The committee of which I have the honor to be a member brought in this legislation to create the bureau and strengthen and facilitate the work. I am glad to have from the gentleman from Alabama, who is a careful student, and knowing the care which he exercises over the expenses of the judiciary, that he has the opinion which he has expressed. The gentleman thinks the bureau can do without this additional money?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I think so.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 35, the paragraph relating to the Department of Justice.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I want to pay a tribute to a remarkable service that Mr. Lawrence and his assistants have rendered to the Government. During the making of the Hawley-Smoot bill, following the hearings, Mr. Lawrence and his two assistants gave us—and, I presume, rendered the same assistance to the subcommittee who had the schedule in charge—a wonderful service. It was very enlightening, very informing, and very helpful to us.

You see, what we were trying to do was to write the schedules so as to avoid the pitfalls and the wide-open places that the customs attorneys drag their clients through in order to avoid the payment of duties, by putting them into a lower classification. On every item Mr. Lawrence and his assistants presented us with cases that had developed during the adjudication and progress of the tariff legislation and showed us where the loopholes were.

The difficulty always was to determine the intent of Congress. In performing this work Mr. Lawrence and his assistants sometimes worked with us until 1 and 2 o'clock in the morning in attempting to rectify the errors and assisting us to prepare the bill.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. While I was not strongly in sympathy with the bill to which the gentleman refers, I have known Mr. Lawrence for a number of years, and I feel that he has been of very great assistance and very efficient in the discharge of his important duties. We gave him one additional assistant at this time, but do not feel justified in giving two assistants.

Mr. CROWTHER. I am glad to know that, because I think he is deserving. In spite of all our care in rewriting the sections (there were very few) new ones, except we introduced a rayon schedule, in spite of the care exercised, there were piled up last year 70,000 appeals, showing that no matter how careful you are you can not get away from the doubt as to just what Congress intended by the language of the law.

That is another indication, if you follow it out to its last analysis, that our tariff bills are lower than they really seem, because every time a case is won the duty is lowered because a new classification and standard is accomplished.

If we win one, we do not gain anything, because the record stands as it is in the paragraph, and, constantly, with the adjudication of these cases, we are losing a little and the tariff is dropping down a little month after month as the cases are adjudicated.

I am glad that the committee saw fit to grant the assistance to this committee, because actually they are producing revenue for the Government; they are at least saving money.

I call the gentleman's attention to a case that occurred here a few years ago. It could only have occurred under the circumstances that existed at that time. An importation was made into this country by an importing concern that was evidently a dummy importing corporation, of 1,760,000 blankets, supplied by the English Government to the French Army. We at that time sold about \$4,000,000,000 worth of material for about \$400,000,000 to the French. This corporation went over there and brought them to the United States, but before they brought them in they found that the duty in the tariff bill was 18 cents a pound and 30 per cent ad valorem. The importers paid for them to France 6 francs apiece, which is about 30 cents apiece, as



the franc was only worth about 5 cents. That would have been 90 cents and 9 cents ad valorem.

However, a brilliant customs attorney said that he could show them how to bring them in more cheaply. He told them to work a little woolen initial with woolen yarn on in one corner and bring them into the country as embroidered articles under paragraph 1430 of the sundry schedule where the duty is 75 per cent ad valorem, an equitable duty for goods that we expected to come in under that paragraph, but when you had a 30-cent value with a 75 per cent ad valorem duty, it amounted to only 22½ cents. They brought those into the United States, and although there was appeal after appeal taken, it never did get to the courts, and that cost the Government \$1,260,000 in loss of duty alone.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Members of the committee have diligently inquired always into whether a law that Congress has passed is being enforced, and we have sought to strengthen the hands of every law officer, and in this case when Mr. Lawrence, who is a very capable official, brought to our attention the need of an assistant, we gave him one.

Mr. CROWTHER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. DYER. I understand the Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Lawrence, receives a salary of \$9,000?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is fixed by the Attorney General. I do not recall the salary, but think it is \$9,000.

Mr. DYER. I agree with what has been said by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] in reference to the Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Lawrence. There has been probably no more capable or able servant of the Government than the Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Lawrence. He is an indefatigable worker and is very efficient. When a man renders service as he does, and is worth as much as he is to the Government, he ought to have the very best assistance and encouragement in doing what he is doing, and he ought to have a decent, living salary. I hope he is getting the \$9,000.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is a matter in the hands of the Attorney General, but my recollection is that the salary of Mr. Lawrence is \$9,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

For such miscellaneous expenses as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General, for the United States courts and their officers, including experts at such rates of compensation as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General, including also so much as may be necessary in the discretion of the Attorney General for such expenses in the District of Alaska and in courts other than Federal courts, and including traveling expenses pursuant to the subsistence expense act of 1926 (U. S. C., title 5, ch. 16), \$1,160,000: *Provided*, That the maximum salary paid to any law clerk to any circuit judge shall not exceed \$2,400 per annum.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Does this limitation of \$2,400 per annum cut down any existing salaries?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; it cuts down law clerks to \$2,400 a year.

Mr. GOSS. What is the salary now?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. This is a new position, and the law provided that the salary should not exceed \$3,000. They were started at \$3,000, and the committee felt that \$2,400 should be the maximum limit. The initial pay should be about \$2,000.

Mr. GOSS. Are there any receiving \$3,000?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Goss: Page 44, line 21, strike out "\$2,400" and insert "\$3,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Prison industries working capital fund: Prison industries working capital fund, 1932 and prior years, is reappropriated and made

available for the fiscal year 1933, including payment of obligations incurred in prior years; and the said working capital fund and all receipts credited thereto may be used as a revolving fund for the fiscal year 1933, for the purposes authorized by the act entitled "An act to provide for the diversification of employment of Federal prisoners, for their training and schooling in trades and occupations, and for other purposes," approved May 27, 1930 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 18, secs. 744d, 744e, 744f).

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

With reference to the items which we have been reading, and those which are to follow, touching appropriations for United States penitentiaries, industrial institutions, and so forth, for the care of prisoners in those places and also in jails, can the gentleman from Alabama tell us something about the amount of increase to the Government for matters of this kind in the last few years?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I went into that fully in my general statement this morning.

Mr. DYER. I am sorry I did not hear the gentleman. I will not take up the time to go over it again at this time, but it has been greatly increased, has it not?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Very greatly increased, and we are here calling a halt for the reasons I stated, that it does not now appear that we will require the same number of prisons in 1933 that it was thought in 1930 were required. So we have recommended some cuts in prison expansion.

Mr. DYER. For instance, the one at Springfield, Mo.?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. We there recommended that no amount be appropriated at this time for the tubercular hospital.

Mr. DYER. It is not the intention, of course, to abandon it?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is a matter that Congress will determine later. In the first place, the contract that has been let for the main hospital has not yet commenced, and the gentleman will note that 430 days are given under the contract to complete it. That runs into 1934, and we thought that at the next session Congress could determine whether to make additional expenditures there. Then there were further considerations that entered into our decision.

Mr. DYER. I do not want to ask the gentleman to go all over this again, but I take it that the gentleman agrees with my judgment that the expense has largely increased?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Oh, there is no question about that.

Mr. DYER. Principally due to prohibition; is that not the fact?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is one of the factors.

Mr. DYER. And a very large factor.

Mr. GOSS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. GOSS. With reference to the salaries and wages of officers and employees mentioned in these many paragraphs, have the wages or salaries been reduced at all?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I do not think there are any reductions. We have made no reductions in salaries except as pointed out. As far as we can learn, in the Department of Commerce there must be some separations from the service, because we have made reductions, and so did the Bureau of the Budget, which will cause some separations from the service.

Mr. GOSS. But there are no general reductions?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. There are no general reductions except where attention has been called to it. We called attention to the one with reference to law clerks in the report. We also called attention to the salaries of the joint commission, and wherever we made reductions in salary they were called attention to in the report, as I recall.

Mr. DYER. Is that true as to the probation system?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes. We made that a maximum of \$2,600. I called attention to that in the House in my remarks this morning.

Permit me to say that in view of the fact that there are two hospitals in which there is some interest felt, and since I did not have an opportunity earlier of making a statement with reference to them, and some Members desire to discuss these two matters, I am willing that those two items, if the



committee approves, may go over until Monday afternoon to be taken up at that time, so that the interested Members may have full opportunity to read the hearings and present their case. We do not want to do injustice to anyone, or to any service. I shall be very glad, if that is the desire of the gentlemen interested in these matters, to request the committee to permit these two items to go over until Monday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield for an explanation? I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and that will be agreeable to me.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The two matters which I thought perhaps Members would be interested in and where we have made some large cuts is the hospital at Springfield, Mo., and the institution in Ohio. I felt, in fairness to the gentlemen, that I would like to have them read the hearings and then if they do not agree with the committee, let the House determine the matter after discussion.

Mr. THATCHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. THATCHER. That is in the Justice Department bill?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes. I made a statement about it this morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. May I make this statement, that it is my purpose to offer an amendment on page 52, in line 16, increasing the appropriation to the amount that the Budget recommended.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. I am perfectly willing to take it up now and dispose of it, but I thought the gentleman might prefer reading the hearings and present his amendment later.

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. Then it will go over until Monday?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. DYER. I would like to ask my colleague from Missouri if his amendment is to provide that the money originally intended for this institution at Springfield shall be carried in this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. May I make this explanation at this time? The original authorization provided that not to exceed \$2,500,000 should be expended for a hospital for defectives at Springfield, Mo. Based upon that authorization the Director of the Bureau of Prisons solicited donations of sites. He gave the data to the people at Springfield and to other communities, and based upon those facts and upon that data the citizens of Springfield donated \$135,000, on the expectation that the original authorization of \$2,500,000 would be expended. My amendment merely seeks to amend the appropriation so that the amount will be carried as originally intended.

Mr. DYER. And that will carry out the agreement which the Government made with the people of Springfield, Mo.?

Mr. JOHNSON of Missouri. That is exactly it.

Mr. DYER. With all due regard to the committee, for which I have the highest respect, it seems to me the committee should not insist upon cutting down the amount under those circumstances, because it has got to be provided for at some time, and that being true, why not at this time and at the same time keeping faith with the people of Springfield, Mo.?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The attitude of the committee is this: It has no desire to present this matter to the committee now, unless the committee wishes it done. I understand the gentleman from Missouri is not in favor of the recommendation made by the committee, and it was because I thought he might prefer to have longer time to read the hearings that I suggested the matter be postponed until Monday.

Mr. DYER. My colleague represents the district in which Springfield is located. I only want to render him, if I can, any possible assistance in seeing that the Government keeps faith with the people of Springfield, Mo.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. On Monday I will further present the views of the committee.

Mr. LOZIER. When does the gentleman now expect to take up this item?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Monday afternoon.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction: For the remodeling and construction of the necessary buildings and appurtenances, purchase of mechanical equipment, and other expenses incident to the construction of buildings in accordance with the provisions of "An act for the establishment of a United States Industrial Reformatory," approved January 7, 1925 (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 832), to be expended under the direction and upon the written order of the Attorney General, or his authorized representative, by contract or purchase of material and hire of labor and services and utilization of labor of United States prisoners, as the Attorney General may direct, \$700,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the total sum to be expended for such purposes shall not exceed \$3,000,000: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury, if in his discretion it would be impracticable to cause the plans, drawings, designs, specifications, and estimates for the remodeling and construction of the necessary buildings to be prepared in the Office of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, and the work of remodeling and constructing the said buildings to be supervised by the field force of said office, may contract for all or any portion of such work to be performed by such suitable person or firm as he may select.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that appropriations relating to the Springfield hospital, Missouri, and the Chillicothe, Ohio, hospital go over until Monday afternoon. The paragraph relative to Chillicothe will be found on page 49, line 19, down to and including line 21, on page 50. The item in reference to the hospital for defective delinquents will be found on page 51, line 23, down to line 17, on page 52. I do this in order that gentlemen may have the opportunity of reading the hearings and presenting their objections to the recommendation of the committee in connection with these two items.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama a question. As I understand, the part of the bill relating to the prohibition appropriation is also to go over until Monday?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That goes over until Tuesday.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So the items relating to the hospitals at Springfield, Mo., and at Chillicothe, Ohio, will be taken up Monday afternoon?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understand we will have an opportunity then to fully discuss the sections relating to the United States Industrial Hospital at Chillicothe, Ohio?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; and to offer amendments thereto. I am doing this only in the interest of gentlemen who I understand are not in agreement with the recommendations of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Federal jails: For the purchase of sites, constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary buildings, purchase and installation of machinery and equipment, and all necessary expenses incident thereto, for establishing new Federal jails and altering and adapting other Government property for jail purposes, as authorized by the act entitled "An act to reorganize the administration of Federal prisons; to authorize the Attorney General to contract for the care of United States prisoners; to establish Federal jails, and for other purposes," approved May 14, 1930 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 18, secs. 753c, 753d), to be expended under the direction and upon the written order of the Attorney General, by contract or purchase of material and hire of labor and services and utilization of labor of United States prisoners, as the Attorney General may direct, \$10,000, to remain available until expended; and the Attorney General may contract with such suitable person or firm as he may select for the work of preparing plans, drawings, designs, specifications, and estimates for remodeling and construction of the necessary buildings.



Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLIVER of Alabama: On page 53, line 16, strike out "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$500."

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment, not for the purpose of preventing the building of the jail in Kentucky but for the purpose of reducing the appropriation.

The Congress appropriated at one time \$1,000,000 and then \$500,000 for the purpose of building jails. There is an unexpended balance of that \$1,500,000, and we had appropriated \$10,000, thinking that the unexpended balance was not so great as we now find it to be. We wanted to give sufficient money to build, if they desired to do so, a jail in Kentucky, where they insisted one was needed.

I find now that there is an unexpended balance sufficient to build the jail, if the Attorney General should decide to do so, without making this appropriation of \$10,000, and for that reason I am reducing it to \$500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Probation system, United States courts: For salaries and expenses of probation officers, as authorized by the act entitled "An act to amend the act of March 4, 1925, chapter 521, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1930 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 18, sec. 726), \$440,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$80,000 of this appropriation may be expended for travel and subsistence: *Provided further*, That no part of this or any other appropriation shall be used to defray the salary or expenses of any probation officer who does not comply with the official orders, regulations, and probation standards promulgated by the Attorney General.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word just to ask the gentleman from Alabama a question.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Again, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, who, I know, is deeply interested in this matter because his committee reported the bill, that I made a very long statement about this just before the bill was taken up under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. DYER. May I just ask the gentleman this question: There is no lessening of the money to carry on this work?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No; we are increasing it by \$210,000.

Mr. DYER. I will say to the gentleman that this is very necessary, because the courts are beginning to take advantage of the law to the very great benefit of the prisoners. They are now able to put a lot of men on probation who are first offenders, and the system is working out remarkably well.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It was at the request of the judges and the Attorney General that this increase was made.

Mr. DYER. I think the Congress should give all possible encouragement to the courts to take advantage of this statute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of China trade act: To carry out the provisions of the act entitled "China trade act, 1922" (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 141-162), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling and subsistence expenses of officers and employees, purchase of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding and computing machines, accessories and repairs, purchase of books of reference and periodicals, reports, documents, plans, specifications, maps, manuscripts, and all other publications; rent outside the District of Columbia; ice and drinking water for office purposes, and all necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, \$22,000: *Provided*, That payment in advance for telephone and other similar services under this appropriation is hereby authorized.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to make a short statement. Mr. Chairman, there has been from time to time some discussion on the floor with reference to our situation in the Far East. It has been intimated that the fact that this statute, known as the China trade act, of which I was the author, was passed, has in effect made it of some concern to our country, as far as the Far East is concerned.

I want to make the statement that this act has nothing of consequence to do with the concern of our country in the Far East at this time. Under this act there has been a good many companies organized in China, mostly with a small capital, to do business, competing with companies under British law and other nationals.

This act was simply for the purpose of giving to our nationals an opportunity to compete with the nationals of other countries on equal terms.

Before the statute was enacted Americans endeavoring to do business in China had to do it under a charter that came from some State because China has not been in a position to grant charters to do business in China.

The United States has no vast interests in China. It is considerable, but we have a great many nationals, in whom we are most concerned at this time, in the Far East. Our concern is for our nationals, wherever they are, and it is the duty of the Government to give to them every protection possible.

According to the latest data available, American investments in China aggregate at least \$150,000,000, as compared with about \$200,000,000 for French investments, \$1,250,000,000 for Japanese investments, and \$1,300,000,000 for British investments.

Some estimates of American investments in China run as high as \$265,000,000, but these estimates include an item of \$75,000,000 for missionary and other noncommercial investments and \$30,000,000 or more for commercial loans unsecured or inadequately secured.

As to foreign investments in Japan, our estimate of the portion held by Americans is about \$385,000,000 as of the end of 1930—all but \$143,000,000 of which is represented by holdings of Japanese Government or Government-guaranteed bonds. No data on British and French investments in Japan are readily available at the moment, but it is probably safe to say that those of the British are somewhat less than ours, while those of the French are relatively small.

In other words, a number of countries have vastly larger interests in China and Japan than we have. We have certain treaty rights under which we do business in China, and have been doing it for some time, with much advantage to our own country.

These corporations, created under the China trade act, and concerning which I arose to speak of, have been of great help in aiding the citizens of this country to take part in the foreign trade of China and putting us on an equal standing and basis with Great Britain, Japan, and some other countries. It has been very helpful.

None of the really big corporations, like the Standard Oil or the American Tobacco Co., have taken advantage of the statute; they are not chartered under it.

I call attention to this so that it may be seen that the statute has been of great benefit to the foreign trade in China and very helpful to this country. I am glad to note that the committee has continued the appropriation for the next fiscal year.

For more detailed information concerning the China trade act companies I include some data from the Department of Commerce. It is as follows:

Hon. L. C. DYER,

*House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In response to your recent request to Mr. A. S. Hillyer, assistant registrar of China trade act companies, I am pleased to submit the attached report to show companies now operating with Federal charters under the China trade act, the date the charters were issued to each, and the authorized capital of each company.

No attempt has been made to report the actual paid-in capital of each company, which, however, it is possible to determine by reference to the balance sheet of the various companies for the year 1930, if such is desired, but at least 25 per cent of the authorized capital has been paid in to conform to the requirements of the act.

Companies now operating under the act total 100, 14 of which were chartered during the past year.

Since the operation of the act 34 companies have ceased to operate and have been granted certificates of dissolution.

It is interesting to note that, doubtless due to the low price prevailing in China of silver, the capital of some of the companies



has been increased, the record showing that during 1931 certificates of amendments to articles of incorporation were issued by the department to seven companies, providing for a capital increase of \$4,476,210 United States currency.

Yours very truly,

FREDERICK M. FEIKER, Director.

*List of China trade act companies—Federal corporations (United States)*

Name	Date of charter	Authorized capital
A. C. K. Co.	Nov. 12, 1927	Mex. \$50,000.
American Asiatic Underwriters	Oct. 29, 1925	Sh. Tls. 2,000,000.
American Chinese Co.	May 26, 1925	U. S. \$50,000.
American Chinese Industries	Jan. 23, 1932	U. S. \$50,000.
American Construction Co.	Jan. 19, 1929	Tls. 200,000 Sh. Syce.
American Far-Eastern Match Co.	Dec. 28, 1931	U. S. \$500,000.
American International Underwriters	Apr. 3, 1928	U. S. \$1,000,000.
American Newspaper Co.	Sept. 14, 1928	Mex. \$50,000.
American-Oriental Finance Corporation	July 29, 1926	Mex. \$8,000,000.
American Oriental Motors	Jan. 24, 1928	Mex. \$100,000.
American Securities	Oct. 14, 1931	Sh. Tls. 8,000,000.
Anderson Ferroggiaro	Apr. 4, 1930	Tls. \$500,000 local currency at Shanghai.
Asia Electric Corporation	Feb. 11, 1931	Mex. \$700,000.
Asia Fire & Marine Underwriters	Oct. 26, 1928	Tls. \$100,000 local currency at Shanghai.
Asia Realty Co.	Aug. 6, 1925	\$11,000,000 Sh. currency.
Asiatic Publishing Co.	Jan. 19, 1929	U. S. \$10,000.
Associated Drug Co.	Jan. 31, 1929	\$100,000 local currency at Hankow.
Automatic Telephones of China	Oct. 30, 1930	U. S. \$200,000.
Aviation Engineering Corporation	Mar. 10, 1931	Mex. \$200,000.
Bakerite Co.	Sept. 15, 1925	Mex. \$1,000,000.
Bills Motors	Nov. 16, 1925	Sh. Tls. 100,000.
Bloch, M., & Co.	July 29, 1930	U. S. \$100,000.
Bolton Bristle Co.	May 24, 1929	Sh. Tls. 500,000.
Bush, Mack & Co.	Dec. 7, 1927	Sh. \$30,000.
China American Engineering Corporation	May 26, 1925	U. S. \$50,000.
China-American Trading Corporation	Jan. 6, 1925	U. S. \$50,000.
China Aircraft Corporation	May 27, 1930	Mex. \$150,000.
China Airways	Sept. 19, 1929	U. S. \$2,000,000.
China Baptist Publication Society	Feb. 11, 1931	U. S. \$200,000.
China Fiber Container Co.	July 22, 1927	U. S. \$250,000.
China Finance Corporation	Nov. 11, 1925	Sh. Tls. 5,000,000.
China Inland Motors	June 25, 1931	Tls. 250,000 Hankow currency.
China Merchants Pongee Association	Sept. 14, 1928	Sh. Tls. 200,000.
China Motors	July 21, 1923	Sh. Tls. 250,000.
China Paper Co.	Mar. 7, 1928	Sh. Tls. 100,000.
China Realty Co.	July 27, 1925	Sh. Tls. 8,000,000.
China Transport & Storage Co.	June 18, 1930	Sh. Tls. 5,000.
Claude Neon Lights	Jan. 19, 1929	U. S. \$624,000.
Commercial Express & Storage	Dec. 28, 1931	Sh. Tls. 200,000.
Commercial Traders Association	May 4, 1929	U. S. \$200,000.
Cosmos Paper Co.	July 29, 1926	Tls. 100,000 Sh. currency.
Danzig, Samuel, Co.	Jan. 17, 1931	U. S. \$50,000.
Doughty, C. J., & Co.	June 8, 1926	U. S. \$100,000.
Eagle Drug Co.	Mar. 10, 1931	Mex. \$50,000.
Eisler, Reeves & Murphy	Oct. 9, 1929	Sh. Tls. 15,000.
Electric Service Corporation	Mar. 25, 1926	Sh. Tls. 750,000.
Essential Oil Products Co.	Mar. 22, 1926	\$200,000 Sh. currency.
Far Eastern Lumber Co.	Aug. 2, 1930	U. S. \$200,000.
Fette Rug Co.	Jan. 15, 1926	Mex. \$200,000.
Ford Hire Service	Sept. 26, 1928	Mex. \$1,000,000.
Fox Film	Apr. 21, 1931	U. S. \$10,000.
Frazier	Aug. 31, 1926	\$500,000 Tientsin \$.
Gale, L. E., Co.	Sept. 7, 1927	250,000 Hankow taels.
Gallop & Co.	May 24, 1929	Mex. \$80,000.
Hayes, J. E., Engineering Co.	July 31, 1925	Taels 120,000 (Shanghai).
Henningsen Produce Co.	Sept. 11, 1928	Sh. Tls. 135,000.
Hornberg & Son	Dec. 30, 1930	U. S. \$50,000.
Hoyt & Co.	June 3, 1925	U. S. \$100,000.
International Bond & Mortgage Co.	Feb. 25, 1927	U. S. \$50,000.
International Finance Corporation	Dec. 4, 1930	Mex. \$500,000.
Kofa (American Drug Co.)	May 23, 1928	Mex. \$1,000,000.
Lang, Robert	May 28, 1925	U. S. \$200,000.
Langdon, E. W., & Co.	Jan. 15, 1926	U. S. \$40,000.
Little Club	July 29, 1926	Mex. \$25,000.
Luebbert's Pharmacy	Feb. 15, 1930	Mex. \$50,000.
Moody, Mark L.	Dec. 21, 1925	Sh. Tls. 1,000,000.
Muller & Phipps (China) (Ltd.)	May 24, 1929	U. S. \$10,000.
National Carbon Co.	Jan. 30, 1931	U. S. \$1,000,000.
National Motors	May 27, 1930	Sh. Tls. 100,000.
Nichols Super Yarn & Carpets	Oct. 3, 1929	U. S. \$100,000.
North-Manchurian Trading Co.	Dec. 20, 1928	U. S. \$10,000.
Odeon Theatre Co.	Sept. 26, 1926	Mex. \$70,000.
Pacific Trading Co.	Jan. 19, 1929	Sh. Tls. 300,000.
Park Garage	Nov. 14, 1928	Sh. Tls. 100,000.
Peacock Enterprises	May 22, 1928	Mex. \$100,000.
Peacock Orient	Dec. 1, 1931	Mex. \$1,000.
Post Mercury Co.	Dec. 28, 1931	Sh. Tls. 500,000.
Raven Trust Co.	Dec. 3, 1926	U. S. \$2,000,000.
Realty Investment	Oct. 3, 1929	Mex. \$500,000.
Reiss, Hugo, & Co.	Mar. 14, 1928	Sh. Tls. 150,000.
Reliance Motors	Feb. 27, 1932	Tls. 400,000 local currency.
Robertson, Evans Motors	Sept. 13, 1929	\$120,000 Tientsin dol.
Shanghai Building Co.	May 31, 1923	Sh. Tls. 1,000,000.
Standard Products Co.	Feb. 7, 1924	U. S. \$100,000.
Standard Machine Co. & National Deep Well Boring Co.	Jan. 28, 1930	20,000 Hankow taels.
Star Cinema Co.	Dec. 4, 1930	Mex. \$100,000.
Tesmenitsky Bros	Nov. 7, 1927	U. S. \$100,000.
Tientsin Fur Exporters	Oct. 14, 1931	U. S. \$40,000.
Tientsin Motors	Jan. 19, 1929	\$50,000 Shanghai currency.

*List of China trade act companies—Federal corporations (United States)—Continued*

Name	Date of charter	Authorized capital
Triangle Motors	Jan. 17, 1931	Sh. Tls. 10,000.
Tri-State Tobacco Co.	June 2, 1928	Sh. Tls. 75,000.
Tsingtan Motors	Jan. 19, 1929	\$50,000 Sh. currency.
Rice, W. R., & Co.	Jan. 15, 1926	U. S. \$50,000.
Union Motors	Aug. 12, 1925	Sh. Tls. 30,000.
United Investments	Sept. 21, 1931	Sh. Tls. 5,000,000.
Universal Hire Service	Dec. 21, 1925	Sh. Tls. 50,000.
Viloudaki & Co.	Nov. 27, 1929	Sh. Tls. 100,000.
Yangtze Mail Line	June 5, 1928	Sh. Tls. 800,000.
Yangtze Rapid Steamship Co.	Nov. 16, 1926	Sh. Tls. 1,500,000.
Yellow Taxi Co. of China	Feb. 25, 1929	U. S. \$500,000.

The approximate authorized capital, expressed in gold dollars, figured at current conversion rates is \$29,436,157.

NOTE.—No attempt has been made to report the actual paid-in capital of each company, but under the act at least 25 per cent of the authorized capital must be paid in before the charter is delivered.

During the year 1931, certificates of amendments to articles of incorporation were issued to seven companies permitting an increase of approximately \$4,476,210 capitalization.

During the year 1931, 14 new companies were chartered under the act, and during the same period certificates of dissolution were issued to 10 companies.

Certificates of incorporation have been issued in this year (1932) to two companies, and certificates of dissolution have also been issued to two companies.

**The Clerk read as follows:**

Load lines on American vessels: To enable the Secretary of Commerce to carry out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to establish load lines for American vessels, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1929 (U. S. C., Supp. V, title 46, secs. 85-85g), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, traveling expenses, rentals, purchase of instruments and other equipment, furniture, stationery and office supplies, repairs to equipment, books of reference and other necessary publications, documents, plans and specifications, contract stenographic reporting services without reference to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5), and all other incidental expenses not included in the foregoing, \$23,440, of which not to exceed \$14,840 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

**The Clerk read as follows:**

Amendment offered by Mr. OLIVER: Page 74, line 4, after the word "exceed," strike out "\$14,840" and insert "\$17,500."

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, this does not increase the appropriation, and is offered at the urgent insistence of the department. They feel that it is important.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

**The Clerk read as follows:**

Amendment offered by Mr. OLIVER of Alabama: Page 92, line 6, after the word "meetings," strike out "of the International Research Council or of its branches and."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

**The Clerk read as follows:**

Pay, commissioned officers: For pay and allowances prescribed by law for commissioned officers on sea duty and other duty, holding relative rank with officers of the Navy, including 1 director, with relative rank of captain, 6 hydrographic and geodetic engineers with relative rank of captain, 10 hydrographic and geodetic engineers with relative rank of commander, 17 hydrographic and geodetic engineers with relative rank of lieutenant commander, 47 hydrographic and geodetic engineers with relative rank of lieutenant, 61 junior hydrographic and geodetic engineers with relative rank of lieutenant (junior grade), 29 aides with relative rank of ensign, and including officers retired in accordance with existing law, \$662,313: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Commerce may designate one of the hydrographic and geodetic engineers to act as assistant director.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of inquiring the reason for the proviso on page 93 of the bill that the Secretary of Com-



merce may designate one of the hydrographic and geodetic engineers to act as assistant director. Is that a new position?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is a proviso that has been carried for some time.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Does that carry a salary?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; it carries a salary. He is appointed from the force. If there is a vacancy when this bill passes, and an amendment to be offered is adopted, then no one can be appointed to a vacancy without the written consent of the President.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commutation of rations (not to exceed \$1 per day) may be paid to officers and crews of vessels of the Bureau of Fisheries during the fiscal year 1933 under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee what the ration is. The bill provides not to exceed \$1. Does the gentleman have the exact amount of the ration?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It varies and depends largely on the size of the boat and the number of employees.

Mr. GOSS. But is the ration of each man so much per day?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. GOSS. Does the gentleman know what that amount is?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It varies, depending on the number in the crew.

Mr. GOSS. Well, can the gentleman give an average?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The average is about a dollar a day, I should say.

Mr. GOSS. The average is a dollar a day?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes; that is about the average.

Mr. GOSS. So that at least it is not any lower than that in the Army and the Navy?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. No, sir; that is about 60 cents, so this is higher.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For printing the weekly issue of patents, designs, trade-marks, prints, and labels, exclusive of illustrations; and for printing, engraving illustrations, and binding the Official Gazette, including weekly and annual indices, \$1,110,000; for miscellaneous printing and binding, \$54,000; in all, \$1,164,000.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to line 11, page 97, for the purpose of asking a question in regard to the item mentioned there.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Why is it necessary to furnish food, fuel, and clothing and the other necessities of life to the natives of the Pribilof Islands of Alaska when we have several millions of our own people here in the United States who are cold and hungry and without a job?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Well, it has been carried for a number of years at that same figure. These people are real wards of the Government, in a sense. We have established some schools there. That service has been carried on since I have been a member of the committee.

Mr. ALLGOOD. How does it come they are wards of the Government?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Well, I have just stated that in one sense they are. We have been caring for them. That has been true since I have been a member of the committee.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning on line 14, page 101, down to the end of line 25 on page 113, all inclusive, go over until Monday evening.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For the expenses of carrying on the work of the Bureau of Naturalization, as provided in the acts authorizing a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens throughout the United States, and establishing the Bureau of Naturalization, approved June 29, 1906, and March 4, 1913, and subsequent acts (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 331-416; U. S. C., Supp. V, title 8, secs. 355-384); including personal services; traveling expenses, and not to exceed \$400 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the naturalization of aliens when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor; street-car fare, telegrams, verifications of legal papers, telephone service in field offices and telephone toll service in the bureau; necessary supplies and equipment for the Naturalization Service; refunding of naturalization fees upon presentation of evidence showing conclusively that the collection and deposit was made through error; not to exceed \$25,000 for rent of offices outside of the District of Columbia where suitable quarters can not be obtained in public buildings; and for mileage and fees to witnesses subpoenaed on behalf of the United States, the expenditures from this appropriation to be made in the manner and under such regulations as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe, \$1,075,770, of which not to exceed \$239,260 may be expended for the salary of the commissioner and other personal services in the bureau in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the compensation of assistants to clerks of United States courts.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the chairman of the subcommittee what is meant by that proviso. Are there any of those assistants to clerks now drawing compensation?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. There are none now getting it, but in the absence of that proviso they would.

Mr. GOSS. I understand that has been the regular practice for some years.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That provision has been carried in previous bills.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I would like to ask a question in regard to the appropriation of \$1,075,770. How does that compare with the appropriation for the last year?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That is a little less than the Bureau of the Budget recommended for this year.

Mr. ALLGOOD. How does this amount compare with last year and the year before?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It is about what was carried last year when you take into account the deficiency appropriation which was made for this service.

Mr. ALLGOOD. The reason I am asking this question is because, as I understand, our immigration has almost ceased, due to the fact that we have put up our immigration bars.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. This fund is also for the purpose of getting many out of the country who are here unlawfully. That is what it is now largely expended for. It is a lump-sum appropriation and used largely for the purpose of deporting aliens. If the gentleman will read the report, he will find that they have deported a very large number during the present year. The number runs well over 25,000.

Mr. ALLGOOD. I note there is an appropriation of \$50,000 for the renovation of buildings and the purchase of equipment at Ellis Island. I favor the expenditure of money used to send aliens out of this country, but with practically no foreigners being permitted to come to the United States through Ellis Island I thought that we could reduce these expenditures.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. They deport probably more from Ellis Island now than come in through that port. That is a deporting station as well as a receiving station.

Mr. ALLGOOD. So it is necessary to keep up the buildings for the purpose of deporting aliens?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes. They are just completing a station at Galveston, from where they are deporting large numbers.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read down to and including line 3 on page 121.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.



Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. McREYNOLDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9349) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 14

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the "lame-duck" amendment and to include therein a short article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Mr. Speaker, the constitutional amendment abolishing the "lame-duck" Congresses will soon be in conference, and I hope the conferees of the House and Senate will be able to iron out the differences and that this amendment, which I indorse whole-heartedly, will soon be submitted to the States for ratification. When this amendment was before this body Hon. W. B. BANKHEAD, of Alabama, proposed an amendment making the term of Representatives four years instead of two. One Member of this House, in speaking against the proposed amendment of Mr. BANKHEAD, said, "I would give up my term as a Member of the House before I would vote to extend that term." At this point I am inserting an editorial from the Southern Democrat, an Alabama paper, touching on this particular amendment:

The Constitution of the United States should be amended so that Congressmen will take their seats in January after they are elected in November and will serve for a term of four years instead of only two. Congress should convene in January instead of the following December. Under our present system a Congressman has to be looking after his political fences all the time and has no time to study great economic and social problems. He is all the time studying about what he can do to popularize himself with the people of his district. Men who have to fight for reelection every two years seldom make statesmen. Give them a rest from politics and they will become more efficient as lawmakers.

No Member of this House can by his vote on this or any other measure extend his own term. If the Bankhead amendment had prevailed our terms of office would all have expired long before it became the law of the land, and the people back home are the ones who would say whether or not our terms would be extended. Therefore it is by their votes that any Member's term is extended even for two years, if a Member of this House could extend his own term, I am afraid that there would be very few elections held in the future.

#### EDUCATING FOR WORLD CONCEPT

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on education.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert the following address made by me at the commencement exercises of the Western Illinois State Teachers College, Macomb, Ill.:

Mr. President, members of the faculty, members of the graduating class, ladies, and gentlemen, the invitation from the Western Illinois State Teachers College, my own beloved alma mater, to be your commencement speaker was a challenge which I could ill afford to evade coming from an institution in a city where I spent three out of five delightful and profitable years as a student in the United States. I am grateful for this signal honor.

My participation in these solemn exercises is provocative of thoughts on the countries which you and I represent and the conditions that therein obtain. The land whence I hail and your land present obvious contrasts. The United States, once but a strip of land along the Atlantic seaboard, in a century and a half has grown into a veritable empire extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Gulf to the Lakes. The Philippines is an island country of 115,000 square miles. The American people, over 120,000,000, possess wealth not enjoyed by any other people in the world, while the Filipino people, numbering 13,000,000, are relatively poor, although not without great resources. Yours is an independent republic, strong and wonderfully self-contained, while mine is still dependent.

The contrast could be continued, but it is not our differences that I wish to emphasize. More significant are our points of contact, our similarities, conditions that suggest analogies. An ordinary mind sees obvious differences of the east and west, but calm reflection reveals the essential parallelisms of culture, hopes, and aspirations. The American and Filipino peoples are alike in their passion for education, in their devotion to religion, in their attachment to progress, in their faith in democracy, in their love of freedom, of peace, and of all those other virtues, ideals, and principles universally recognized as invaluable and priceless.

#### PROGRESS TOWARD WORLD FEDERATION

The last century witnessed gigantic strides toward the goal which has been the dream of those who were once ridiculed as visionaries but whom time has since vindicated and who are now looked upon as statesmen and sages. We are living witnesses of the great shrinking of the world, brought about by modern inventions and discoveries, by the arts and sciences. Synchronous with this phenomenon has come a development in the concept of man adequate for a changing and an advancing world. There is now a general recognition of the fundamental unity of mankind.

Ours is an era of progress. It is an epoch headed toward greater cooperation, harmony, and peace. It is an age when "the parliament of man" and "the federation of the world" are becoming a reality. If education is to continue as an agency of progress, it must be utilized as an instrumentality to promote the dominant thoughts and tendencies of the times. A new demand is placed upon higher institutions of learning, that of educating for world concept.

#### WORLD AIM OF EDUCATION

Among graduates of a teachers' college it is unnecessary to discuss in detail the various aims of education which have been expressed in terms of utility, of knowledge, of morality, of character, of citizenship, and of efficiency. All that need be done is to remind them that the definitions of education have kept pace with world changes and have invariably reflected imperious philosophic trends.

What is the aim of education at an age such as ours and in a world continually in a state of flux? I answer, education must be a process of securing for every individual, for every nation, and for humanity at large the highest and fullest measure of efficiency, freedom, and happiness.

We must educate for world concept in order to make universal the blessings of efficiency, freedom, and happiness.

#### THE WE CONCEPT

Education is, as it has always been, a process of developing and magnifying concept. It is a means of emancipating the individual and society from the narrow, selfish concept to the broad humanitarian concept.

To make my meaning clear let me bring to bear a Filipino point of view upon this thought.

There is one feature of the Filipino language which is unique and distinctive. It has twice as many numbers as there are in English. Ours has four numbers while yours has but two, the singular and the plural. Let me illustrate this in the language which I know best, the Ilocano.

In my native language we have these words:

1. Siac, which means "I"; this is the singular number.
2. Data, which means "we two"; this is the dual number.
3. Dacami, which means "we three or more," but is exclusive; this is what I call the intermediate plural or the plural exclusive number.
4. Datayo, which means "we" in the all-inclusive sense; this is the plural all-inclusive number.

Derived from these we have the possessive forms cuac, meaning "mine" exclusively; cuata, meaning "ours," but confined to two and only two; cuami, meaning "ours," signifying possession on the part of three or more, but automatically excluding others; and cuatayo, meaning "ours," which is truly plural all inclusive.

On the basis of these four numbers we have corresponding concepts. I shall illustrate. The word house in my language is balay. If I say balayCO, I mean that the house is mine exclusively; it expresses the singular concept. If I say balayTA, it means that the house belongs to me and one other; it signifies the dual concept. If I say balayMI, it means that the house belongs to me and two or more others, but exclusive of the rest; it expresses the plural exclusive concept. If I say balayTAYO, it means that the house belongs to all, exclusive of none; it expresses the plural all-inclusive concept.

Redefining education in terms of these ideas, I would say that it is a process of emancipating the individual and society from the purely singular concept, through the dual concept and the plural exclusive concept, to the plural all-inclusive concept. If education has for its mission the development of world concept, it must set itself consciously and persistently to the task of utilizing the content and method of education so as to function in broadening and magnifying concept from the extreme I-stage to the extreme We-stage. If educators, therefore, are to be accelerators of progress, they must send forth men and women from the higher institutions of learning imbued with the We concept. Such a mission entails preparing for citizenship of one's town, city, state, or country and citizenship of the world. A world concept is fundamental to world citizenship.

If we carefully analyze the growth of a cultivated individual we shall find that he undergoes these four stages corresponding to the four numbers which I have indicated. A child comes into the



world selfish, egoistic, even egotistic. His first world is circumscribed by his self and selfish interests. While he is in the I stage, the I stage, or the singular stage, his world revolves on the axis of his ego. At such a stage he wants a monopoly of things. He is not concerned with sharing. When a child living in such a world lays his hand on something edible, he wants it all for himself.

A little later he emerges from this narrow world. The idea of sharing dawns upon him. He is promoted to the data stage, or the We-two stage. His concept is no longer purely singular; it is dual. Give him something while at this stage, say, an ear of corn. He is now willing to divide it. But if left to himself, he divides the ear of corn into two unequal parts, and when he offers one part to his brother or sister he is careful to keep the larger one to himself. His concept has been broadened; it has been dualized, but the feeling of selfishness yet dominates.

Still later he is further promoted. Through a process of magnifying concept he is ushered into the dacami stage, the intermediate We stage or the plural exclusive stage. His concept is broadened, pluralized, let us say, but it is not wholly altruistic.

It is much later, if at all, when he is truly educated that the individual is emancipated and enters upon a far greater world. He advances to the datayo stage, the real We stage or the plural all-inclusive stage. His concept is truly pluralized. Ideas and ideals of altruism dominate his life and conduct. Not till such a point is reached, not till an individual possesses a true world concept, may his education be said to be complete.

What has been said of an individual undergoing these stages is true with a community or nation. A social or national concept has its narrowness, bigotry, and selfishness. Nations there are that live in stages that fall far short of the We stage or the plural all-inclusive concept. Citizens in countries at such stages tend to develop patriotic attitudes which are narrow and chauvinistic. Such attitudes are apt to lead to indifference, aloofness, suspicion, enmity, or war, rather than tolerance, confidence, good will, friendship, cooperation, harmony, and peace.

#### ADEQUATE BASIS FOR WORLD DEMOCRACY

It is necessary to find an adequate basis for the new order in accordance with this world concept. The spirit of imperialism, economic greed, vainglory, superiority, self-sufficiency, exploitation, domination, or like attitude clearly can not be an adequate basis for a world democracy. As long as selfish or antisocial attitudes dominate individuals and nations there can be little or no development of genuine cooperation among the peoples of the world.

Many things that are being done in social institutions designed to educate are not contributing to cooperation, harmony, and peace on earth. The placing of swords, revolvers, and guns in the hands of little children as toys; the use of cannons and cannon balls as decorations in private yards and public places; the undue featuring of wars and war heroes in the press and history texts; the learning of geography, with a disproportionate emphasis upon one country, as if it were more important than all other countries on earth; the teaching of civics to exalt the men and institutions of one's country and belittling those of others; the ignoring of the economic, the cultural, and the spiritual riches of other peoples and races—these and a thousand things that we do and fail to do in schools, colleges, and universities are retarding progress toward that objective of broad concept and understanding and sympathy, the consummation of which enlightened mankind devoutly covets.

Every people has its points of strength and points of weakness. No nation, however high in the scale of civilization, has a monopoly of virtues. No race, however far behind in the march of progress, has a monopoly of vices. Every nation, every race, has a contribution to humanity's common fund of knowledge and experience. The spirit of no one people, no one nation, no one race can be made the basis for a world democracy. A world concept is essential and necessary. Nothing less than the common denominator of mankind, to which the various peoples, nations, and races must contribute their best, can ever serve as an enduring basis for amity among peoples and peace among nations. This must be the basis of world democracy.

But with all the shortcomings and imperfections of human beings and human institutions there is reason for optimism. The progressive movement of the world is steady. The perfectibility of the human race is unlimited.

In our day we see evidences that there is a broader consciousness of human interrelations. There is, indeed, a new international conscience. There is less race antagonism, less arrogance, less intolerance, less disposition to exploit and to disregard the laws and principles of international life. There is a more general desire for good will, for understanding, for cooperation, for friendship, and for peace. There is greater disposition to accord good motives to others, to appreciate the cultures of other peoples, to respect their individualities, customs, idiosyncrasies, practices, hopes, and ideals and to see the good in other nations.

I think I can with propriety speak of these things representing as I am a people who are beneficiaries of the contributions of peoples from both hemispheres. My country has an oriental setting. We are essentially of Malayan ancestry. With a background of our own culture and civilization, we are inheritors of the traditions, practices, and faiths of various nations of the Far East. We have also received the impact of European culture. And more recently, by the coming of America to our shores, our life has been enriched by Anglo-Saxon influences. We are anxiously awaiting the day when the people of this great Republic shall grant us the boon of national freedom, for that day will be the commencement of a new renaissance in our civilization.

America's emergence to a position of world power was comparatively recent. Her high place among the world powers really was achieved within our generation. In a little over three decades America rose to a commanding position among the nations. After the World War she became a leader in world affairs. In the events of the last decade she had a conspicuous part in making the world more truly one and united.

The organization of the League of Nations, the establishment of the World Court, the inauguration of disarmament conferences, the celebration of world conventions, the approval of numerous peace treaties, the repeated avowals to renounce war as an instrument of national policy and to adopt pacific means to settle international differences are indicative of a new world conscience. We are in very truth at the dawn of a new age of greater security. There is a new spirit of peace.

Yet many still delight in asserting and reiterating a philosophy conceived in a world war weary "that the best way to prepare for peace is to prepare for war." If we wish to perpetuate war as an instrument of national policy, none is better calculated to foster it. But if we are really sincere and earnest in our desire for peace, then we must school individuals and nations in the thought that the only way to have peace is to prepare for peace.

Peace is a necessary condition in a world that has become so thoroughly interdependent and among peoples whose interests have come to be so closely intertwined. Now or in the future there can be no war of serious proportions without affecting human existence; no considerable overproduction or underconsumption without affecting the economic balance of the world; no marked decline in the value of silver or gold without threatening a serious crisis that would encircle the globe; no great epidemics or other calamities without producing concern everywhere; no upheavals, political or otherwise, that do not interest the leaders and statesmen of all nations. The good of one country is the welfare of all. The ill of one is the concern of all. It behooves us to remove those conditions that disturb equilibrium and to create conditions favorable to peace.

#### OBSTACLES TO WORLD PEACE

In the midst of this universal quest for an enduring basis of a new social order, two great obstacles beset the path to world peace. I refer firstly to race prejudice and, secondly, to unwelcome interference.

Race prejudice has been an archenemy of world progress. Although some races have been more guilty than others, every race has been afflicted with this malady.

The first step is a frank recognition that race prejudice is an obstacle to world amity.

The next step is valiantly to meet it and apply the remedy.

There are four stages in the development of racial consciousness. These are:

1. Racial innocence;
2. Racial prejudice;
3. Racial intelligence; and
4. Racial sympathy.

Children are by nature color blind. Place children together and, regardless of nationality or race, they mingle, play, and enjoy together. Prejudice is not inborn. It is injected in the innocent minds of childhood by ill-advised adults. By innuendoes or by overt acts children are influenced by older folks suffering from race-superiority complex to emerge from their racial innocence to the stage of race prejudice.

It is only by a proper knowledge of the achievements of other races and an appreciation of the excellence of every people that individuals acquire an intelligent attitude toward peoples and races. But it is not enough that there be racial intelligence. There must be a heart development, hence the need of racial sympathy. The racial attitudes of educated men and women must be elevated to the plane of racial intelligence and racial sympathy, for these are basic to race understanding and world amity.

The other obstacle to world peace is international meddling. Nations, especially those with imperialistic designs, impose control over other peoples and races. This unwelcome interference is a violation of the right of every nation to self-sovereignty.

The remedy lies in educating peoples in the principle of equality. Let one of the self-evident truths enunciated in the American Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal be made world-wide in its application and its observance.

This Nation went further in its declaration of purpose when she entered the World War. It went beyond the principle that all men are created equal. It enlarged it by saying that all nations, great and small, are entitled alike to self-determination. This ideal must be made real and universal. No nation worthy of the name is so ignorant that it can not manage its affairs better in the long run than unwelcome outsiders. Nations, like individuals, should observe in their dealings the principle of "live and let live" if they can not practice the ideal of "live and help live."

#### CHALLENGE TO EDUCATION

The new world situation presents a mighty challenge to educators and teachers. A new responsibility must be borne by educational agencies. For this task teachers must have a truly pluralized concept and must educate the youth for world concept.

With this concept as a guide, with world peace as an aim, with efficiency, freedom, and happiness as the trinity of objectives, education must busy itself with habituating children in friendship projects; training boys and girls in the arts of peace; accustoming young men and young women in those attitudes, thoughts, and habits of right perspective, broad sympathy, sane intelligence, and



righteous tolerance, imbuing all with a proper understanding, appreciation, and knowledge of the worth and merit of individuals, peoples, and races, their culture and their achievement.

I am not unmindful that the task is difficult and complex. I am aware that education for these high and noble ends involves patient, scientific, and painstaking working out of the necessary technique. I am conscious that it means a thoroughgoing revision of texts, eliminating every misinformation, falsehood, or exaggeration, presenting facts and truths. I am sensible that it means a reform of subject matter and method, doing away with whatever makes for hatred and distrust, removing causes of misunderstanding and war, and creating facilities for peace and co-operation. I know that it is not easy to readjust conditions to suit worthy ends or to control processes and procedures to attain objectives.

And yet this is the great commission to teachers and educators, educational institutions and educative agencies. Nothing worth while and permanent can be accomplished unless it is backed by an enlightened public opinion. Education, if it is to continue as a vital force, must assume this mission until the great ideal shall be sufficiently dynamic that governments will provide ministries and secretariats of peace even as we now have ministers and secretaries of war; that leaders of vision shall be more interested in civilizing militarists than in militarizing civilians; and that peoples shall live as members of one family, cooperating in all that makes for efficiency, freedom, and happiness.

We must educate for world concept if we are to bring the world to the high plane of our cherished dreams and fond desires where—

"The common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,  
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapped in universal law."

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, February 22, 1932, at 11.30 o'clock a. m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

450. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a complete set of general rules and regulations prescribed by the Board of Supervising Inspectors, Steamboat Inspection Service, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DAVILA: Committee on Insular Affairs. H. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to correct the spelling of the name of the island of Porto Rico; without amendment (Rept. No. 585). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POUL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 151. Resolution creating the economy committee; with amendment (Rept. No. 586). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SWING: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 4715. A bill for the protection of the Palo Verde Valley, State of California, against injury or destruction by reason of Colorado River floods; with amendment (Rept. No. 587). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GILBERT: Committee on the Library. S. 1861. An act authorizing the George Washington Bicentennial Commission to print and distribute additional sets of the writings of George Washington; without amendment (Rept. No. 588). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1931. A bill for the relief of Ned Bishop; without amendment (Rept. No. 589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 6. An act for the relief of the Union Ferry Co., owners of the ferryboat *Montauk*; without amendment, Rept. No. 590). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COYLE: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 922. A bill for the relief of John Heffron; without amendment (Rept. No. 591). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8229) granting a pension to Jerusha G. Gilbert; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 5769) authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Thomas H. Laird; Committee on Naval Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 9230) granting a pension to Mary E. Allen; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 9587) to amend the civil service retirement act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 9588) for emergency flood relief of Palo Verde Valley, Calif.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. GLOVER: A bill (H. R. 9589) to amend the revenue laws of the United States and to provide for the collection of an income tax on capital invested in foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 9590) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of tobacco by the Department of Agriculture," approved January 14, 1929; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 9591) to extend the period of time during which final proof may be offered by homestead entrymen; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 9592) to provide for the regulation of the business of making loans of \$300 or less in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GARBER: A bill (H. R. 9593) to provide for the payment to veterans of the face value of their adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 9594) to insure payment of bank deposits in national banks and member banks of the Federal reserve system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KLEBERG: A bill (H. R. 9595) to restore to their former retired status in the Regular Army of the United States persons who resigned such status to accept the benefits of the act of May 24, 1928 (46 Stat. L. 735), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EATON of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9596) to designate a memorial highway to be known as George Washington Bicentennial Highway; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 9597) to appoint a special assistant secretary in the Department of Labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 9598) to authorize increased expenditures for the enforcement of the contract-labor provision of the immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Resolution (H. Res. 156) for the purpose of the United States acquiring the property of Mount Vernon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution (H. Res. 157) providing for the consideration of H. R. 8088, a bill to provide for co-operation by the Federal Government with the several States in relieving the hardship and suffering caused by unemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) to request the President of the United States to submit to the Congress specific information for the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.



By Mr. BLOOM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 309) authorizing the Postmaster General to make a just and equitable compensation for the past use in the Postal Service of a certain invention and device for the postmarking of mail packages and for the more permanent cancellation of postage stamps, during the time the said device was in use by the Post Office Department, not exceeding or going beyond the life of the letters patent thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SIROVICH: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 23) authorizing the acceptance by the United States of a bust of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe; to the Committee on the Library.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 9599) for the relief of Ben D. Showalter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 9600) for the adjudication and determination of the claims arising under the extension by the Commissioner of Patents of the patent granted to Frederick G. Ransford and Peter Low as assignees of Marcus P. Norton, No. 25036, August 9, 1859; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: A bill (H. R. 9601) for the relief of Taylor Marlor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9602) granting an increase of pension to McKinley Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9603) granting a pension to Harrison Canipe; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CARTER of Wyoming: A bill (H. R. 9604) relating to the induction of Thomas M. McKinney, who applied and was accepted for induction and assigned to an educational institution for special and technical training under the act approved August 31, 1918; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 9605) for the relief of Annie Moultrie; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9606) for the relief of the estate of Clarendon Davis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 9607) for the relief of Arthur Bussey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9608) for the relief of Albert Davis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN: A bill (H. R. 9609) granting a pension to Jesse Carl Arnold; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 9610) granting a pension to Samuel Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 9611) granting a pension to Delia Louck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9612) to correct the naval record of John William O'Neill; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KVALE: A bill (H. R. 9613) granting a pension to Baldie Henry Koenig; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAMNECK: A bill (H. R. 9614) granting an increase of pension to Julia E. Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9615) for the relief of warrant officers, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 9616) granting a pension to Minerva J. Atkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9617) granting an increase of pension to Frances Ransom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LUDLOW: A bill (H. R. 9618) granting a pension to Pearl Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 9619) granting a pension to Emeline M. Salstrom; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9620) for the relief of Thomas Kirwan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN: A bill (H. R. 9621) granting a pension to Frank H. Wood; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARCOURT J. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 9622) granting an increase of pension to Anna Keener; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 9623) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Reynolds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9624) granting a pension to Louise C. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REID of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 9625) granting a pension to Christine Ufer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNOW: A bill (H. R. 9626) granting an increase of pension to Leroy C. White; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMASON: A bill (H. R. 9627) granting a pension to Collis Monk; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 9628) for the relief of Ulysses Green; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2508. By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of Joseph J. Northup and 48 other citizens of Peace Dale, Wakefield, West Kingston, Saunderstown, Narragansett, and East Greenwich, all in the State of Rhode Island, opposing the repeal, resubmission, or any modification of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2509. By Mr. Andrews of New York: Petition of Polish National Alliance of United States of America, urging memorialization of October 11 as General Pulaski's day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2510. Also, petition of Lockport Board of Commerce, urging support to the suppression of narcotics; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2511. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of the governing board of Local 802, American Federation of Musicians, Associated Musicians of Greater New York, comprising 16,000 citizens of Greater New York, urging the passage of the old age security bill, H. R. 7926; to the Committee on Labor.

2512. By Mr. CAMPBELL of Iowa: Petition of Adult Bible Class of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Peterson, Iowa, and the Congregational Missionary Society of Peterson, Iowa, opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or by State legislatures, and in favoring adequate appropriations for law enforcement and for education in law observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2513. By Mr. CLAGUE: Petition of H. W. Franklin, of Vernon Center, Minn., and others, protesting against the passage of House bill 8092, compelling barbers to observe Sunday in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2514. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of residents of Schenectady County, N. Y., urging support of the eighteenth amendment, and opposing its modification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2515. Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Gloversville, N. Y., urging adequate appropriations for law enforcement, and opposing resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by the State conventions or by State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2516. Also, petition of Niskayuna Woman's Christian Temperance Union, No. 61, of Schenectady, N. Y., urging support of the eighteenth amendment, and opposing its resubmission to be ratified by State conventions or by State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2517. Also, petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church Home Missionary Society of Canajoharie, N. Y., opposing resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or by State legislatures, and urging support of the amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2518. By Mr. DAVENPORT: Petition of E. Kent Evans and 12 other residents of Holland Patent and Remsen, N. Y., favoring the maintenance of the prohibition law and its enforcement, and opposing any measure looking toward



its modification, resubmission to the State, or repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2519. By Mr. DICKINSON: Petition of the Methodist, Baptist, Christian, Presbyterian, and Cumberland Presbyterian Churches of Greenfield, Mo., protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2520. By Mr. EATON of Colorado: Resolution adopted by delegates at the Western Governors Conference in Portland, Oreg., October 29, 1931, urging the President of the United States to call an international conference on silver; to the Committee on Coins, Weights, and Measures.

2521. By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of Collins M. Graves, of Bennington, Vt., urging submission of the eighteenth amendment to a referendum vote in the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2522. Also, petition of Seth N. Gage, of Ascutney, Vt., urging submission of the eighteenth amendment to a referendum vote in the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2523. Also, petition of Frederic P. Clement, of Rutland, Vt., urging submission of the eighteenth amendment to a referendum vote in the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2524. Also, petition of Gertrude Daniels, of Grafton, Vt., urging submission of the eighteenth amendment to a referendum in the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2525. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Albert M. Reed, of Manchester, Vt., urging submission of the eighteenth amendment to a referendum vote in the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2526. Also, petition of J. B. Aikman, of Chester, Vt., urging submission of eighteenth amendment to a referendum vote in the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2527. By Mr. GILCHRIST: Petition of Rev. Louis J. Runion, representing the people of Homer community, Homer, Iowa, opposing the resubmission of the eighteenth amendment to be ratified by State conventions or by State legislatures, and urging maintenance of existing prohibition enforcement laws and activities, and protesting any change; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2528. By Mr. HOOPER: Petition of residents of Coldwater, Mich., and vicinity, protesting against enactment of House bill 8092 or any other Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2529. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Texas Reclamation and Drainage Association, by John T. Fortson, president, and Guy M. Gibson, secretary and treasurer, urging passage of the Glenn-Smith bill; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

2530. Also, petition of F. N. Drane, of Corsicana, Tex., favoring passage of the Glenn-Smith bill; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

2531. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of Samuelson-Healey Post, No. 1845, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2532. Also, petition of Erdsword Farmers Union, Local No. 122, Taunton, Minn., urging enactment of Senate bill 1197; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2533. Also, petition of Hennepin County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2534. Also, petition of Erdsword Farmers Union, Local No. 122, Taunton, Minn., urging enactment of Senate bill 2487; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2535. Also, petition of Farmers Union, Local No. 225, Balaton, Minn., urging enactment of Senate bill 1197; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2536. Also, petition of Farmers Union, Local No. 225, Balaton, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 7797; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2537. Also, petition of Farmers Union, Local No. 225, Balaton, Minn., urging enactment of Senate bill 2487; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2538. Also, petition of Operative Plasterers' Local, No. 65, Minneapolis, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2539. Also, petition of Albert Standaert and two other members of the Oscar I. Mongeau Post, No. 742, Marshall, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2540. Also, petition of Northwest Pay Bonus Now Organization, of Taconite, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2541. Also, petition of 500 stockholders and patrons of the Wheaton Co-op. Creamery Co., urging the United States against international entanglements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2542. Also, petition of Hantho Local, No. 136, Farmers' Union, of Appleton, Minn., urging enactment of Senate bill 1197; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2543. Also, petition of Hantho Local, No. 136, Farmers' Union, Appleton, Minn., urging enactment of Senate bill 2487; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2544. Also, petition of Grace Local, No. 130, Farmers' Union, of Montevideo, Minn., urging enactment of Senate bill 2487; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2545. Also, petition of Grace Local, No. 130, Farmers' Union, Montevideo, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 7797; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2546. Also, petition of American Legion Post, No. 87, Alexandria, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2547. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Ohio Emergency Committee, Columbus, Ohio, with reference to relief appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2548. Also, petition of Mid-West Labor Council, Rock Island, Ill., favoring certain amendments to the Davis-Bacon law to correct the shameful and appalling practices with reference to pay of employees and hours of daily labor; to the Committee on Labor.

2549. Also, petition of Cameron Machine Co., 61 Poplar Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the establishment of the Everglades national park in Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2550. Also, petition of New York State Nurses Association, favoring the passage of the Bankhead bill, H. R. 7525; to the Committee on Flood Control.

2551. Also, petition of H. J. Rosenblum, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Goss bill, H. R. 4680; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2552. By Mr. MURPHY: Petition of Carrie Davis, 706 Walnut Street, Martins Ferry, Ohio, and 24 other members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Martins Ferry, supporting the prohibition laws, and against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2553. By Mr. REED of New York: Petition of residents of Almond; Mrs. L. George, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and members of the Baptist Church, of Sinclairville; Mertha Bliss, secretary of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Belmont; Granger Grange No. 1116, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Hume Home Bureau, and the Parent-Teacher Association, of Fillmore; Nellie Mason, corresponding secretary of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Falconer; Rev. William P. Sipe and others, of Cattaraugus; Short Tract Methodist Episcopal Church, of Fillmore; and the Fairbanks Bible Class of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Jamestown, all of the State of New York, protesting against the repeal, resubmission, or modification of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2554. Also, petition of Margaret Logan and others, of Jamestown, and Mrs. J. J. Williams and others, of Randolph, N. Y., urging the support of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against any measure looking toward its modification, resubmission to the States, or repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.



2555. By Mr. ROBINSON: Resolution for the independence of the Philippine Islands, signed by Ernest M. Wright, field secretary Iowa State Dairy Association, Waterloo, Iowa, insisting that independence be granted the Philippine Islands at once. Until independence is granted the present situation compels farmers in the United States to meet unfair competition of the Philippine products on our domestic markets. By granting this independence we will be keeping our promise to these islands and at the same time preserving the American market for the American farmer. We urge that the Iowa State Dairy Association unite with all other farm and dairy groups and do everything possible to secure this independence. We believe the existing tariffs on dairy products should be maintained; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2556. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of Webster Groves Camp, No. 43, Department of Missouri, United Spanish War Veterans, Webster Groves, Mo., indorsing House bill No. 7230; to the Committee on Pensions.

2557. Also, petition of Webster Groves Camp, No. 43, Department of Missouri, United Spanish War Veterans, Webster Groves, Mo., opposing the reduction of appropriations for the Regular Army, National Guard, and Organized Reserves, and any reduction in the number of officers and enlisted men in the Regular Army; and favoring the appropriation of the full amount recommended by the Budget Bureau for the Army, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and citizens' military training camps; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2558. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of New York State Nurses' Association, favoring the passage of Bankhead bill, H. R. 7525; to the Committee on Flood Control.

2559. Also, petition of H. J. Rosenbloom, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Goss bill, H. R. 4680; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2560. Also, petition of Bird Lovers' Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the establishment of the Everglades national park in Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2561. Also, petition of American Rattan & Reed Manufacturing Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Kahn bill, H. R. 6744; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

2562. Also, petition of Cameron Machine Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the establishment of the Everglades national park in Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2563. Also, petition of T. J. Oakley Rhinelander, of New York City, opposing further reduction of the Budget for national defense; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2564. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Resolution of the congregation and Sunday school of the West Kendall Free Methodist Church, Kendall, N. Y., opposing resubmission of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2565. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the Court St. Joseph's, No. 884, Catholic Daughters of America, of Keyport, N. J., protesting against House bills 4757 and 4739; to the Committee on Education.

2566. By Mr. CHRISTGAU: Resolution adopted at the annual meeting of the Litchfield Creamery Co., Litchfield, Minn., relative to establishing unfettered trade relations between this and other nations, and reducing Federal expenditures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2567. Also, resolution adopted and submitted by the Lake Stay Local, No. 178, of the Farmers' Educational and Co-operative Union of America, Minnesota division, Arco, Minn., favoring the passage of Senate bill 1197, introduced by Senator FRAZIER; Senate bill 2487, introduced by Senator WHEELER; and House bill 7797, introduced by Representative F. B. SWANK; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2568. Also, resolution adopted at the annual convention of the Minnesota Telephone Association in St. Paul, Minn., protesting against the placing of taxes upon telephone toll messages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2569. Also, petition signed by members of the Minnesota Bird Club, of Minneapolis, Minn., urging support of House bill 12381, providing for the establishment of the Everglades national park in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

2570. Also, petition signed by citizens of Stewartville and Simpson, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 8092, providing for the observance of Sunday by barbers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2571. Also, petition signed by citizens of Dodge Center, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 8092, providing for the observance of Sunday by barbers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2572. Also, petition signed by citizens of Ellendale, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill 8092, providing for the observance of Sunday by barbers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1932

The Senate met, under the unanimous-consent agreement, at 11.15 a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who turnest the hearts of the children unto the fathers and hast declared that the righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance, be graciously pleased to sanctify to this Nation the influence of Thy servant, George Washington, as we commemorate the anniversary of his birth and pay loving tribute to his character and the genius of his leadership in the founding of our Republic.

In this our day of opportunity bestow upon us those noble qualities of manhood reflected in his life that we, too, may be valiant without ambition, confident without assumption, discreet without fear, resourceful in danger, resolute in adversity, triumphant in faith. We invoke Thine especial blessing upon the President of the United States, the Vice President, the Members of the Congress, and all others in authority, that they may so lead and direct the people of our land that when we shall have served Thee in our generation we may be gathered to our fathers, having the testimony of a good conscience, in favor with Thee our God, and in perfect charity with all mankind. All of which we ask through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Wednesday, February 17, 1932, when, on request of Mr. FESS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9203) to improve the facilities of the Federal reserve system for the service of commerce, industry, and agriculture, to provide means for meeting the needs of member banks in exceptional circumstances, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. BRAND of Georgia, Mr. STEVENSON, Mr. MCFADDEN, and Mr. STRONG of Kansas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 292) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to aid in the establishment of agricultural credit corporations, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JONES, Mr. FULMER, and Mr.